

INFORMATION SERVICES DIVISION
Toronto Board of Education



RESEARCH SECTION
Library Services Department

TEACHING HERITAGE LANGUAGES
AND CULTURES IN AN
INTEGRATED/EXTENDED DAY

Sylvia Larter
Maisy Cheng

#181

July, 1986

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Research Report #181

TEACHING HERITAGE LANGUAGES AND CULTURES IN AN INTEGRATED/EXTENDED DAY

The main purpose of this study was to describe the setting of the newly developed Toronto Board Integrated/Extended Day Heritage Language and Black Cultural Programs in terms of social, cultural, economic, educational, political, demographic and psychological variables.

The study began with several weeks of intensive exploratory fieldwork during the winter of the 1984-85 school year that included interviewing and observing in the fifteen elementary schools then offering the programs. It culminated in October, 1985 with the distribution of detailed survey questionnaires to all the principals, vice-principals, teachers, administrative assistants, lead instructors, heritage language instructors, Black cultural instructors, concurrent instructors and parents involved with the fifteen schools.

Of those who responded to the survey, 88% believe that children should learn their heritage languages mainly:

- (1) to improve communications with relatives,
- (2) to enhance pride in heritage,
- (3) to maintain and revitalize culture and religion, and
- (4) because languages are best learned when young.

Children can be taught their heritage languages and cultures in a variety of ways - at home, after-school classes, summer classes, weekend classes, during extended school days and by using them as media to learn other school subjects. Not everyone agreed on the best method. However, if they are taught during an extended day, then late afternoon was considered by many the best arrangement.

The text and tables in this report describe and detail a multitude of issues related to the integrated/extended day programs including methods of implementation, effects on the children, effects on the regular staff and school day, working and social accommodations between the teachers and instructors, reactions of regular staff as described by themselves and perceived by others, opinions about the instructors, distribution of information, responsibilities and duties of regular staff and instructors, involvement of parents, materials and resources, and changes that should be made if the program is to be continued.

Summaries of several randomly selected pupil interviews are included.



ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors would like to express their thanks to:

- the principals and vice-principals in the Integrated/Extended day schools for making special arrangements for the various research activities in their schools both during and after school hours. They also agreed to be interviewed, and many responded to the questionnaire;
- the teachers in the Integrated/Extended day schools who participated in the interviews and responded to the questionnaire;
- the administrative assistants in the Integrated/Extended day schools who were interviewed and completed the questionnaire. Many also helped with the distribution of the questionnaires to various groups in the schools;
- the Heritage Language, Black Cultural and Concurrent instructors in the Integrated/Extended day schools who agreed to be interviewed, and many who allowed their classes to be observed. Some also completed the questionnaire;
- the lead instructors in the Integrated/Extended day schools who were interviewed and responded to the questionnaire. Some helped in facilitating research activities during the various stages of this study;
- the sample of students enrolled in the Heritage Language, Black Cultural and Concurrent classes who were interviewed;
- the parents of the Integrated/Extended day schools who agreed to be interviewed and/or responded to the questionnaire;
- the members of the Chinese and Greek parent associations who scheduled special meetings for the investigators;
- the language lead instructors across all Heritage Language and Black Cultural programs who agreed to a group interview and/or responded to the questionnaire;
- the executives of the Toronto Teachers' Federation and the Toronto Public School Principals' Association who were interviewed;
- the School Community Relations Department for translating the questionnaire and making arrangements for interpreters to be present at parent meetings. Several SCR officers and workers also participated in a group interview;

- Several Board administrators directly and indirectly involved with the Integrated/Extended day programs for participating in interviews;
- the Heritage Languages Department and the Alternative and Community Programs Department for providing updated enrolment lists, instructor addresses, etc.;
- Audrey Anthony, who was responsible for packing and unpacking the outgoing and incoming questionnaires. She also coded most of the questionnaires;
- Laura Jacobs, who coded part of the questionnaires;
- Vita Vogl and Vicki D'Souza, for typing the tables in the report; and
- Deborah McFarlen, who was responsible for the typing and layout of the questionnaires and did some computer data entry. She also patiently typed several drafts and the final version of the text.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
Research Activities	5
HERITAGE LANGUAGE QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONDENTS	8
Principals and Vice-Principals	8
Teachers	8
Administrative Assistants	8
Lead Instructors	8
Heritage Language Instructors	8
Concurrent Instructors	8
Black Cultural Instructors	8
Parents	9
RESULTS	12
Should Children Learn Their Heritage Languages?	12
Reasons Children Should Learn Their Heritage Languages	12
By What Methods Should Children Learn Their Heritage Languages in Toronto?	13
What is the Best Organization for HL/BC/CC Classes in the I/E Day Programs?	14
Opinions About the Implementation of the Integrated/Extended School Day	16
Does the I/E Day Affect Children Differently from the Regular Day?	19
Does the I/E Day Affect the Community and Parents Differently from the Regular Day?	22
Does the I/E Day Affect the Regular Staff Differently from the Regular Day?	23
Does the I/E Day Affect the School Differently from the Regular Day?	25
Working and Social Accommodations Between the Teachers and Instructors in the I/E Day Schools . . .	27

How Should Principals and Vice-Principals React to the I/E Day?	30
How Do Principals and Vice-Principals React to the I/E Day?	32
How Should Teachers React to the I/E Day?	31
How Do Teachers React to the I/E Day?	31
Opinions About the HL and BC Instructors	32
Opinions About the CC Instructors	34
Information About the HL/BC/CC Programs in the I/E Day Schools	34
Conflict About the HL/BC/CC Programs in the I/E Day Schools	36
Responsibilities of Principals and Vice-Principals in the I/E Day Schools	37
Responsibilities of Administrative Assistants in the I/E Day Schools	37
Duties of Local School Lead Instructors	38
Duties of Language Lead Instructors	41
Role of Parents in the I/E Day Schools	41
Involvement of Parents in I/E Day Schools	41
What Changes Should Be Made if the Programs Continue?	42
HL Instructors' Descriptions of Children in HL Classes	50
CC Instructors' Descriptions of Children in CC Classes	50
Comparison of Integrated HL Classes With Other Types of HL Classes	50
Comparison of Integrated BC Classes With Other Types of BC Classes	51
Activities and Methods Used to Teach HL and CC Classes	51
Materials Used to Teach HL and CC Classes	51
Other Materials Instructors Would Like	51
Sources of Materials	53
Opinions About Regular School Programs in Toronto Elementary Schools	53

PUPILS IN INTEGRATED/EXTENDED DAY SCHOOLS	55
HL/BC Pupils' Opinions	55
CC Pupils' Opinions	56
SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION	57
APPENDIX A: TABLES A1 - A9	61
APPENDIX B: TABLES B1 - B51	71
APPENDIX C: TABLES C1 - C12	139
APPENDIX D: SUMMARIES OF INTERVIEWS OF PUPILS IN I/E DAY SCHOOLS	154
APPENDIX E: ONTARIO MINISTRY OF EDUCATION MEMORANDUM 1976-77:46	172
APPENDIX F: INTEGRATED/EXTENDED DAY HERITAGE AND CONCURRENT PROGRAMS OPERATIONS MANUAL	175
APPENDIX G: TORONTO BOARD OF EDUCATION FACT SHEETS	185
APPENDIX H: COVERING LETTERS TO PARENTS (ENGLISH AND CHINESE)	188

INTRODUCTION

On June 15, 1977, the Ontario Ministry of Education released Memorandum 1976-77:46 which reads in part:

... the Ministry of Education will implement a Heritage Languages Program to be effective as of July 1, 1977. For the purposes of this program, a heritage language is any language other than the two official languages of Canada.

An amendment will be made to Regulation 191 to allow for the provision of heritage language classes for elementary school children by all school boards.

Under this program, any group of parents will be able to approach its local school board with the request that heritage language classes for elementary school children be given under the Continuing Education Program. Such classes may be offered after school, or on non-school days, or where numbers justify an extension of the required 5-hour school day. Under this program, no student may receive more than 2 1/2 hours instruction per week, or more than 2 1/2 hours per day in the case of summer school classes.

... Boards wishing to set up heritage language classes must accept full responsibility for the staff, curriculum, and supervision of the classes, and subscribe to the usual conditions of evening and summer school programming.

... The instructors hired by the boards for these classes need not have Ontario certification but should have qualifications acceptable to the boards, principals, and the parents' groups.

(The entire memorandum is included as Appendix E.)

During 1981, Ontario Regulation 617/81 amended Regulation 262 made under the Education Act so that the "required 5-hour school day" must exclude recess time. For most schools in the Toronto Board of Education, the regulation meant an additional 150 minutes of instructional time per week.

In March of 1982, a Work Group on Third Language Instruction of the Toronto Board of Education published its final report

entitled Towards a Comprehensive Language Policy. The following are some of the recommendations in the report:

- That the Toronto Board of Education petition the Ontario Ministry of Education to permit the teaching of Heritage Languages during the additional 150 minutes per week required by the Ministry.
- That in schools where integrated Heritage Languages Programs are established, such programs as cross-cultural studies, Latin, Native Peoples' languages and Native Peoples' Studies be introduced for students who do not take part in the Heritage Languages Program.
- That the Director of Education develop and implement a two-phase plan for integrating the Heritage Languages Program with the regular program throughout the Toronto school system and that:
 - (a) phase I of the plan provide for the integration of Heritage Languages classes in five to ten schools, in addition to the present schools with the integrated Heritage Languages Program, beginning in September, 1982.
 - (b) phase II of the plan provide for the establishment of integrated programs in additional schools annually, over the next three-year period.
 - (c) both phases include provision for local school and community consultation.
- That school principals and staffs, with the co-operation of the School Community Relations Department, if necessary, make every possible attempt to encourage the parents of their communities to enrol their children in Heritage Language classes wherever actual student population warrants.
- That the Toronto Board of Education adopt the principle of bilingual/trilingual education as a fundamental principle of its education policy.
- That the Toronto Board of Education request the Ontario Ministry of Education to amend the Education Act:
 - (a) to permit the use of languages other than English and French as media of instruction during the regular school day.

- (b) to facilitate the development of bilingual and trilingual education as proposed in this report.
- That the Director of Education develop a comprehensive, in-depth documentation report based on available research and other valid information documents on the subject of bilingual/trilingual education.
- That the Director prepare a proposal for a research project, to be done in conjunction with outside agencies, if possible, to examine the correlations between enrolment in Heritage Language Programs (integrated and otherwise), first language competence, academic performance (in English, French and other areas) among students whose first language is neither English nor French, and that such research include documentation of relevant programs.

On May 12, 1982, the Chairman of the Board forwarded to the Minister the recommendations on third language which the Board approved on May 6, 1982. The Minister replied in a letter dated June 9, 1982. She stated in part:

The commitment of the Toronto Board of Education to the development of programs which are sensitive to the language backgrounds of its pupils is acknowledged. However, it is our feeling that this commitment can be realized within the existing provisions of the Education Act and Regulation 262.

The Government, therefore, is not prepared to make changes to the language requirements currently set out in the Education Act.

The Board's unsuccessful petition of the Ontario Ministry of Education to permit the teaching of Heritage Languages during the additional 150 minutes per week meant that if the Heritage Languages were to be integrated with the regular program in the Toronto school system, the school day would have to be extended another 30 minutes. Consequently, during the 1984-85 school year, fifteen elementary schools in the Toronto school system were operating according to a schedule referred to as an Integrated/Extended (I/E) school day for the purpose of teaching Heritage Languages (HL) and Black Cultural Heritage (BC).

During 1984-85, these fifteen extended-day schools had a total of 138 integrated HL/BC classes ranging from one to eight languages per school. The languages were Arabic, Chinese (Cantonese), Greek, Hindi, Italian, Portuguese, Panjabi, Spanish, Urdu and Vietnamese. Black Cultural classes were also offered in

two of the I/E day schools.

Prior to 1984-85, pupils in the I/E day schools not enrolled in HL/BC classes were the responsibility of the regular teachers. They usually stayed with the teachers in the regular classrooms and did such things as homework, remedial work and housekeeping, although in some cases the teachers developed special programs for these children. This arrangement required that teachers be responsible for and/or teach pupils for an additional 150 minutes per week which was not required of other teachers in the system. The Board's elementary teachers then made the decision early in 1984 to withdraw their voluntary services. In February, 1984, a Letter of Understanding Committee on "Provision of Heritage Language Programs within the Integrated/Extended Day" made up of representatives of the Board and the Toronto Teachers' Federation met several times and recommended (among several items) the following, that was approved by the Board on February 21, 1984:

Board to provide concurrent program in all existing integrated/extended day schools and any new ones, i.e.,

- classroom teachers will not be required to have any direct involvement with the concurrent program;
- classroom teachers will not be required to have any direct involvement in integrated/extended program;
- classroom teachers will not be assigned other duties during the time their pupils are involved in the Heritage Language/Concurrent programs;
- classroom teachers will be expected to continue to fulfil their professional commitment for remedial programming as may be appropriate.

The Concurrent Program (for pupils not enrolled in HL/BC classes) was staffed by persons hired from outside the TBE, not necessarily with Ontario teaching certificates, but with special areas of expertise. The Concurrent (CC) classes that were offered varied from school to school but included enrichment activities such as karate, puppetry, music, storytelling, rocketry, crafts and cross-cultural studies.

The process of becoming an I/E day school in 1984-85 for the purpose of teaching Heritage Languages and Black Cultural Heritage involved several steps including school designation, consultation, planning and staffing. Several types of staff and committees were part of the total package. There were Heritage Language, Black Cultural and Concurrent Instructors. There were also Local School Lead Instructors and Language Lead Instructors. (Roles and titles of Lead Instructors have since been changed.) A local school liaison committee consisting of parents and the

school principal assisted in staffing, scheduling of classes, curriculum and program evaluation. The Heritage Languages and Concurrent Program Consultative Committee (HELACON) (previously HLAC - The Heritage Language Advisory Committee) advised the Board of Education on matters pertaining to the HL/BC/CC programs and was composed of trustees, one elected representative from each language program, one representative from the Toronto Public School Principals' Association, one representative from the Toronto Teachers' Federation, one representative from the Library Board, and four representatives for Concurrent Programs. The entire Integrated/Extended Day Heritage and Concurrent Programs Operations Manual is included in Appendix F and fully describes all these details. The TBE fact sheets on the programs are included in Appendix G.

Research Activities

In December, 1983, the Research Department prepared an interim proposal suggesting that the above stated recommendations related to research be conducted in three phases:

- (1) In-depth documentation and review of research related to bilingual and trilingual education;
- (2) Documentation and ethnographic study of the Integrated/Extended Day Heritage Language Programs; and
- (3) Correlational study of enrolment in Heritage Language Programs, first language competence and academic performance.

The literature review was completed in 1984 and exists as Research Report #175 under the title Bilingual Education and Bilingualism: A Review of Research Literature.

What follows is a report of phase two - the documentation and ethnographic study of the Integrated/Extended Day Heritage Language Programs.

Phase Two: Research Methods

The purpose of this phase was to describe the setting of the Integrated/Extended Day Heritage Language and Black Cultural Programs in terms of social, cultural, economic, educational, political, demographic and/or psychological variables. A second purpose was to supplement the themes and findings of the literature with ideas characteristic of the Toronto setting to design phase three.

This phase began with several weeks of intensive exploratory fieldwork during the winter of the 1984-85 school year. The work involved interviewing and observing in the fifteen I/E day schools. Principals, vice-principals, administrative assistants, teachers, HL/BC/CC instructors, HL/BC/CC pupils, HL/BC/CC parents, lead instructors, superintendents, administrators, personnel of the School Community Relations (SCR) Department and representatives of the Toronto Teachers' Federation (TTF) and Toronto Public School Principals' Association (TPSPA) were interviewed. Several HL/BC/CC classes were observed in each I/E day school. The investigators also observed and participated in

meetings of various committees such as HELACON and the local school liaison committees.

Because of time constraints and the numbers involved, it was not possible to interview every teacher, pupil and parent. Consequently, in each school, the TTF representative and a 20% random sample of teachers were interviewed. In the case of the pupils, each HL, BC and CC instructor of the classes observed was asked to select the one boy and one girl whose birthday was closest to January 1st; these were the pupils who were interviewed. Interviews with the parents were organized in a variety of ways, sometimes with individuals identified by the principal, sometimes as part of agendas of other teacher-parent meetings, and sometimes in meetings especially scheduled for the researchers. Interpreters were frequently present while interviewing the parents.

Although several of the HL, BC and CC instructors worked in more than one of the I/E day schools, each was interviewed only once. The local school lead instructors were interviewed in the schools, and the language lead instructors were interviewed as a group.

Opportunity was provided for TTF to observe at meetings between the researchers and local school liaison committees, at the recommendation of the Board.

After completion of these exploratory fieldwork activities, the investigators then (during March of 1985) set about designing a set of survey questions that could be used to give everyone associated with the fifteen I/E day schools a chance to express their opinions.

The survey questionnaires were built entirely from the ideas and concepts encountered during the fieldwork and recorded in the notes that were taken. This meant that the questionnaires contained considerable detail; however, an effort was made to keep them simple to answer, most questions requiring only a quick check. Copies of the questionnaires are not included in this report, as the tables used to report the data in Appendices A, B and C represent the ideas contained in them. Anyone wanting copies may obtain them by contacting the authors.

Eight questionnaires were developed, one for each group - principals/vice-principals, teachers, administrative assistants, parents, HL instructors, BC instructors, CC instructors and lead instructors. A large proportion of questions was repeated for each of the eight questionnaires, and each contained as well a set of questions to be answered solely by the respective group of respondents. The parent questionnaires were translated into the twelve major languages used in the homes of the children in the fifteen I/E day schools. (Principals were surveyed for this information.) The languages were: Chinese, French, Greek, Hindi, Italian, Korean, Polish, Portuguese, Panjabi, Spanish, Urdu and Vietnamese. Finally, a covering letter was composed and translated to accompany the questionnaires for each group. The letters for the English-speaking parents and Chinese-speaking

parents are shown as examples in Appendix H.

The questionnaires were completed and ready for distribution in May, 1985. However, the process was delayed due to a variety of sensitive issues including teacher negotiations and an arbitration related to the I/E day that TBE administrators and executive of the TTF feared would be affected by the release of the questionnaires in the system.

Distribution of questionnaires finally took place in October, 1985. Because of staff changes, schools were contacted to update the lists of names, and questionnaires were then sent to all the principals/vice-principals, teachers, administrative assistants, lead instructors, and HL, BC and CC instructors who had worked in the fifteen I/E day schools for the 1984-85 school year and during the fall of 1985. In some cases, this meant that home addresses had to be obtained; however, the bulk of the questionnaires were sent out through the board mail.

Parents received their questionnaires through their children in the schools (one per family) and then returned them in the stamped envelopes that were provided. All parents received an English questionnaire and letter, and many also received the appropriate translated version. Upon return of the envelopes, a careful check was made to ensure that only one questionnaire per parent was analyzed.

Questionnaires were returned to the Research Services office for several weeks until the end of 1985, during which time they were sorted and coded. Analyses began in February of 1986.

HERITAGE LANGUAGE QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONDENTS

Principals and Vice-Principals

Twenty-two principals and vice-principals held positions in the fifteen Integrated/Extended Day schools during the time of the study. A questionnaire was sent to each; 16 (73%) responded.

Teachers (Table A1)

A total of 262 teachers taught in the fifteen schools during the two years of the study and remained as employees of the Toronto Board of Education. Each was sent a questionnaire, and 50% responded. The teachers were asked to name the cultural or ethnic groups to which they belong; the results were 37% Canadian or French Canadian, 35% European, 3% Chinese, 1% Japanese and 1% Australian. Another 23% did not answer the question and/or objected to it.

Administrative Assistants

Sixteen administrative assistants held positions in the fifteen schools during the two years of the study and remained as employees of the Toronto Board of Education. A questionnaire was sent to each, and 10 (63%) responded.

Lead Instructors (Table A2)

Twenty-four language lead instructors and local school lead instructors were involved with the fifteen schools during the two years of the study. A questionnaire was sent to each; 6 (25%) responded. These six instructors were somewhat more likely to have obtained their qualifications and teaching experiences in Canada than outside Canada.

Heritage Language Instructors (Table A2)

Sixty-six HL instructors were involved with the fifteen schools during the two years of the study. A questionnaire was sent to each; 11 (17%) responded. The majority of these eleven instructors had obtained teaching certificates and taught outside Canada.

Concurrent Instructors (Table A2)

Fifty-six CC instructors were involved with the fifteen schools during the two years of the study. A questionnaire was sent to each; 22 (39%) responded. Very few of these twenty-two instructors had teaching certificates, although 50% had B.A.'s and 9% had M.A.'s.

Black Cultural Instructors

Five BC instructors were sent a questionnaire; none responded.

Parents

Approximately 2800 families with children attending the fifteen I/E day schools received questionnaires; 449 (16%) responded.

Parents were asked at the end of the questionnaire to indicate whether they had children in HL, BC or CC classes and if so, how many. And then, based on the responses, the parents were divided into four groups as follows, and all data were analyzed separately for these four groups.

HL/BC Parents (N=239)

These parents had children in Heritage Language (N=234) or Black Cultural (N=5) classes. Of these parents, 211 reported a total of 333 children in these classes; the other 28 parents did not indicate the number of children.

CC Parents (N=103)

These parents had children in the Concurrent classes. Of these parents, 88 reported a total of 126 children in Concurrent classes; the other 15 parents did not indicate the number of children.

HL & CC Parents (N=65)

These parents had children in both Heritage Language and Concurrent classes. Of these parents, 60 reported a total of 91 children in Heritage Language classes and 87 children in Concurrent classes; the other five parents did not indicate the number of children.

UI Parents (N=42)

These parents chose not to identify themselves by the classes their children attended.

Socio-Economic Status of the Parents (Table A3)

The socio-economic status (SES) of the four groups of parents (HL/BC, CC, HL & CC, UI) is different. CC parents are not so likely to be classified as low SES as are the other three groups.

The Cultural or Ethnic Groups to Which the Children Belong (Table A4)

The 373 parents who supplied information on the culture and ethnicity of their children named a total of 25 groups (45 parents said their children belonged to two or more groups). The

largest numbers of parents described their children as Chinese (29%), Canadian (28%), Portuguese (8%), and Italian (6%).

The HL/BC parents named a total of 16 groups; the largest numbers described as Chinese (31%), Canadian (23%), Portuguese (12%), and Italian (6%).

The CC parents named a total of 18 groups; the largest groups described as Canadian (50%), Chinese (11%), Italian (7%), and English/British/WASP (5%).

The HL & CC parents named a total of 12 groups; the largest numbers described as Chinese (63%), Canadian (11%), Greek (6%), and Italian (5%).

Many (45%) of the UI parents did not respond. Those who did named a total of 10 groups; the largest numbers described as Canadian (21%), Chinese (14%), Portuguese (5%), Italian (5%), Vietnamese (5%), Greek (5%), East Indian (5%), and French (5%).

Languages the Children Learned to Speak (Table A5)

The 418 parents who indicated the languages their children learned to speak first named a total of 21 languages (48 parents said their children learned two or more languages simultaneously). The largest numbers named English (38%), Chinese (31%), Portuguese (10%), Greek (5%), and Italian (5%).

The HL/BC parents named a total of 13 languages; the largest numbers named English (32%), Chinese (31%), Portuguese (16%), Italian (6%), Greek (5%), and Vietnamese (5%).

The CC parents named a total of 15 languages; the largest numbers named English (60%), Chinese (14%), and Portuguese (6%).

The HL & CC parents named a total of 11 languages; the largest numbers named Chinese (66%), English (26%), Greek (6%), and Italian (5%).

Many (26%) of the UI parents did not respond. Those who did named a total of 11 languages; the largest numbers named English (33%), Chinese (19%), Portuguese (5%), Vietnamese (5%), Hindi (5%), French (5%), and Panjabi (5%).

The Cultural and Ethnic Groups to Which the Children Belong in Individual Heritage Language and Black Cultural Classes (Tables A6 and A7)

The Spanish, Italian, and Portuguese HL classes are most heterogeneous with respect to the cultural and ethnic groups of the children. The Spanish HL classes, for example, have children from this sample of respondents who are Spanish, West Indian, Canadian, Filipino, Yugoslavian and Hungarian. The Italian HL classes are more likely than other HL classes to be made up of children whose parents refer to them as Canadian.

The First Languages of Children in Individual Heritage
Language and Black Cultural Classes (Tables A8 and A9)

Children in Spanish, Hindi, Panjabi and Black Cultural classes are most likely to have learned English first, while those in Vietnamese, Chinese, Portuguese and Urdu classes are least likely. The Italian and Portuguese HL classes are most heterogeneous with respect to the first languages of the children. The Italian HL classes, for example, have children from this sample of respondents who learned Italian, English, Portuguese, French, Ukrainian and Gujarati first. The children in Hindi, Greek and Spanish HL classes are most likely to have learned two languages simultaneously in the home.

RESULTS

Should Children Learn Their Heritage Languages? (Table B1)

A total of 644 persons participated in this survey; 569 (88%) answered "YES" to this question. Among the ten groups of respondents, lead instructors answered "YES" most frequently (100%), and concurrent instructors least frequently (77%).

Reasons Children Should Learn Their Heritage Languages (Table B2)

Respondents who answered "YES" to the first question were then asked to check one or more of nineteen reasons children should learn their heritage languages.

An examination of the percentages across the ten groups of respondents for each of the nineteen reasons indicates that the following four reasons have the strongest support:

- (1) Improves communication with relatives;
- (2) Enhances pride in heritage;
- (3) Languages are best learned when young;
- (4) Maintains/Revitalizes culture and religion.

And, these four reasons have the weakest support:

- (1) Improves communication in school yard;
- (2) Provides a chance to excel;
- (3) Facilitates learning English;
- (4) Improves other academic learning.

In considering these reasons, the comments of three interviewees are interesting:

I am not sure that the surface structure of the Chinese language will help the Chinese children learn English. I support the heritage language program for self-esteem reasons. We must be certain of the claims we make for the program. I am not certain that learning of one language helps the learning of another language. (Teacher)

Heritage language class helps my child improve his Chinese. He feels more comfortable talking to me and his grandparents in simple Chinese and understands 90% of our Chinese conversation at home. His Chinese language skills will come in handy when we visit his other set of grandparents in Hong Kong next summer. (Chinese parent)

The Chinese children in Toronto get Chinese at home, in the newspapers, on the radio, at movies and in the shops and restaurants. They are seeing only Chinese; they should see

a wider world. They will be ill-prepared. Their abilities in English may be slowly dropping. (Teacher)

Some groups of respondents checked more reasons for learning heritage languages than others, thus indicating stronger support for the concept. For example, 50% or more of the lead instructors and HL instructors checked 14 reasons for children learning their heritage languages. The numbers of reasons checked by 50% or more of the other groups are as follows:

HL & CC parents -	13
HL/BC parents -	10
Administrative Assistants -	7
UI parents -	6
Principals/Vice Principals -	4
Teachers -	4
CC parents -	4
CC instructors -	3

By What Methods Should Children Learn Their
Heritage Languages in Toronto?
(Table B3)

The Integrated/Extended school day, Saturday morning classes and after school classes are the three methods most preferred for teaching children their heritage languages in Toronto. HL/BC parents, HL & CC parents, HL instructors and lead instructors are those who most prefer the Integrated/Extended school day (50% - 82%); teachers, lead instructors, principals, administrative assistants and CC parents are those who most prefer after-school classes (29% - 45%); and teachers, administrative assistants, CC parents and principals are those who most prefer Saturday morning classes (25% - 42%).

Using heritage languages as media to teach some or all school subjects, or teaching the languages during the summer are, overall, the least preferred methods (0% - 33%).

The ranges of percentages have been included to show that some groups are stronger in their preferences than others.

During the interviews, everyone had a lot to say on this topic, and many of the arguments that were presented for and against the various methods will be presented later in this report. However, at this point, a sample of comments from various persons is informative:

As a teacher from a minority group, I fail to see the value of teaching heritage languages during the school day. They should be learned at home. It is the responsibility of the parents. They are best taught by the parents. They should be learned outside school by visiting people and places. School is an artificial place for learning heritage languages. (Teacher)

I succeeded in getting more children (especially Portuguese and Panjabi) enrolled in heritage language classes by having them in the I/E day. As part of the regular program, the languages get more recognition. However, the price is that some children do not want to be in the classes, and the principal is forced to give extra encouragement. (Principal)

The I/E day gives more value and status to the language. Instructors feel like professionals. Instructors get more support from principals and others than they do when classes are held after school and on Saturday. Children are respected more for their knowledge of another language. (Greek Instructor).

Chinese students seem to be happier in the I/E day arrangement. They have a "standing tall", "walking tall" feeling because they can identify with adults of the same cultural background. (Chinese Instructor)

I prefer the I/E day because there are other family activities on Saturday. During the weekdays, children are already in school, so they might as well stay a bit longer to learn their heritage languages. (Italian parent)

When the classes are not integrated, it is particularly difficult during the winter. Many trips must be made by parents and pupils if they are not integrated. Kids used to complain that other kids got out of school earlier than they did. (Greek parent)

What is the Best Organization for HL/BC/CC Classes
in the I/E Day Programs?
(Table B4)

Total Time Per Week

The Ontario Ministry of Education's Memorandum 1976-77:46 (see Appendix E) states that, "...no student may receive more than 2 1/2 hours instruction per week..." With the exception of the administrative assistants, the highest percentage of every group of respondents believes that 150 minutes (2 1/2 hours) a week is the best amount of time. The administrative assistants favor less than 150 minutes a week.

It should also be noted that quite a few teachers and UI parents did not have an opinion, and several HL instructors would like more than 150 minutes a week.

Number of Periods Per Week

Not many strong trends of opinions exist among the groups of respondents on this matter, although "3 periods" and "5 periods" are more favored than other numbers of periods. Several parents interviewed said they preferred a daily lesson because:

...children remember what they learn better.
They learn bit by bit. If held once or twice
a week, the lesson is easily forgotten, and
it is more difficult to maintain interest.
(Chinese parent)

The researchers also observed some HL/BC/CC classes of 75 minutes duration that seemed too long. Limited materials and resources and a lack of variety in teaching methods tended to make the time drag.

The Time of Day

There is very little support for teaching HL/BC/CC programs in the morning or early afternoon. Late afternoon is considered the best arrangement, although a substantial proportion of every group had no preference. It is, however, the opinion of many that whatever is taught at the end of the extended day, that is the time the children are most tired and teaching is least effective. For this reason, some parents and instructors would prefer the languages taught earlier in the day. For this same reason, many teachers were concerned that the core curriculum (the primary responsibility of the schools) not be taught at the end of the day.

During the interviews, some parents and instructors also expressed concerns that HL/BC classes at the end of the day meant that they were not truly integrated and, in fact, were no different from after-school classes.

Instructors' Timetables

With the exception of the HL instructors, those working in the I/E day schools strongly favor having all the HL/BC/CC classes blocked at the same time. The opinions of the four groups of parents on this issue are diverse.

Blocked timetables are favored by many because it means that different students are not withdrawn from the regular classes at different times of the day to attend HL/BC/CC classes.

In the case of the instructors, blocked timetables are apt to mean they must travel from school to school to build up teaching time instead of teaching several lessons at different times of the day in one school.

Blocked timetables mean that in schools where several HL classes as well as BC and CC classes are taught, as many as 22

instructors may converge on the schools at once.

Class Size

The general feeling is that the size of the HL/BC/CC classes should not exceed 20 students, and there is quite strong support for even smaller classes. The size recommended by the Board is 20 pupils, although (to the consternation of some), the Board does not always insist on it.

Those who favor smaller classes do so for a variety of reasons. One reason is that some language groups (e.g. Vietnamese) cannot have classes in some schools because they cannot gather together 20 children. A second reason is that many HL/BC/CC classes are made up of multi-age, multi-cultural, multi-interest, multi-ability children, meaning that large classes present many pedagogical problems.

Number of Languages Per School

On the whole, respondents either have no opinions on this topic or are accepting of "any number" of languages per school. However, substantial proportions (over 30%) of seven respondent groups think that the number should not exceed four.

Opinions About the Implementation of the Integrated/Extended School Day (Table B5)

Representation

Everyone was asked to indicate whether they felt the representation of the principals, teachers, administrative assistants, instructors and parents is good with respect to the implementation of the I/E school day.

Of the ten groups of respondents, teachers and CC parents are least satisfied with the general representation of the various groups while lead instructors, HL instructors, HL/BC parents and HL & CC parents are most satisfied.

The teachers and CC parents are least satisfied, while the HL instructors are most satisfied about their own representation.

Overall, respondents were most likely to say that principal representation is good.

One teacher's dissatisfaction with representation was expressed in this way:

The I/E day program was dumped on us. There were a couple of token meetings for teachers to ask questions, but we got no answers. The message we got was, "this is the policy - you have to do it." Teachers, as a whole, are not against heritage languages but are opposed to having it dumped on us. The Board

lost the teachers' support on this. (Teacher)

A CC parent had this to say:

The Board hasn't thought through the problem. We are guinea pigs. We are upset about how the whole thing is being handled. It's just dumped on our laps. (CC parent)

Resources and Information

The three groups of regular school staff, CC parents and CC instructors were not as impressed by the quality of the resource people and information used during the implementation of the I/E day as the other five groups of respondents. Some wondered about how research information was being used:

Referring to research about teaching heritage languages that was done with other groups in other areas (e.g., Navajo children in the United States) is like comparing apples and oranges. (Teacher)

Some school staff felt neglected by resource persons:

The teachers got zero help from the consultants, Area Superintendents and trustees. We need to talk to someone about our fears. The only information we get is from the Toronto Sun. They should come and win us over. They did an okay public relations job with the parents, but they've never done anything with the teachers. (Teacher)

Concurrent parents frequently expressed feelings of having been misinformed:

We were not truthfully informed during the consultation process. The I/E day program was sold to us like a vacuum cleaner. They made it sound as if all the kids would benefit. Things came out after it was implemented, such as not being able to get extra English in concurrent classes. (Concurrent parent)

Power Struggle vs Interests of the Children

Regular school staff tend to perceive the implementation process as a power struggle among many groups, while HL instructors, HL/BC parents, HL & CC parents and UI parents are more likely to believe that the best interests of the children have been considered. The comments of two principals are illustrative:

We are caught in a war between the TBE and the TTF. (Principal)

What is the role of the trustee? Is the trustee a resource person or an educator? Education is now political. It doesn't matter what professional educators say. We must meet political needs. Should the needs of the trustees or the kids be met first? (Principal)

Trustees and Board Administrators

Have the trustees and Board administrators attended to all groups during the implementation of the I/E day? Many of the respondents had no opinion. However, just over 50% of the HL/CC parents believe that both trustees and administrators have done so, and just over 50% of the HL instructors believe the trustees have done so.

Democracy, Taxpayers' Money and Promises

Respondents were asked whether the implementation of the I/E day had been democratic, whether the programs are a good use of taxpayers' money, and whether promises have been fulfilled. The HL instructors alone are strongly convinced about all three points, although the HL/BC and HL & CC parents tend to support the first two. Persons who felt the implementation was undemocratic did not necessarily think that way for the same reasons:

I think the program should be discontinued. Any parent who wants their children to learn a heritage language should have them stay after regular school hours. I don't think other children should be penalized because of the wishes of some. It is undemocratic. (Concurrent parent)

The schools make the final decisions; it doesn't matter what the parents say. (HL parent)

The regular teachers can't talk to us. We feel badly about not being able to talk to teachers to get their ideas and help about the program. (CC parent)

A system that does not cater to the total population of students is not a fair system. Some children do not get taught their heritage languages because their numbers are too small. (Vice-principal)

Teachers should have an active part in the formation of the program. We are not permitted to defend our classes, our

position, our pupils or ourselves. We cannot help but be unhappy about the situation.
(Teacher)

It is demeaning for TTF and TPSPA representatives to attend HELACON. The vote is usually 22 vs. 2. (Teacher)

Similarly, persons who felt that promises had not been fulfilled varied in their elaborations on the matter:

Many promises for help (e.g. a vice-principal) did not arrive.
(Administrative Assistant)

Last year when the teachers were doing the concurrent classes, an administrator said we would get help. No one came. We had to prepare the units ourselves. (Teacher)

We were promised computers for the concurrent program. Nothing happened. (CC parent)

Voting Procedures

The Operations Manual in Appendix F describes the voting procedures. The regular school staff and the three groups of instructors mostly agree that the voting should be conducted on an individual school basis but also feel that more than a 50% vote should be required before the Board proceeds with implementation in any one school. The four groups of parents, on the other hand, are not so likely to believe the implementation should take place according to these two voting conditions.

Enrolment

Regular school staff, lead instructors and HL instructors believe the I/E day is best implemented when 50% or more of the students in a particular school enrol in the HL and BC programs. CC instructors and all parent groups are much less firm on this matter.

Some children and/or their parents change their minds during the school year and request to switch HL/BC/CC classes. (The combinations of possible switches in some schools are numerous.) Principals, administrative assistants, HL instructors and HL & CC parents tend to agree that switching should be allowed. Teachers and CC instructors are least enthusiastic about switching.

Does the I/E Day Affect Children Differently From the Regular Day? (Tables B6 and B7)

Those who have known the children in both an I/E day and a regular day - principals, teachers and parents - were asked to judge whether the I/E day affects children differently and to

check one or more of thirty-six possible effects. Nearly all the principals and teachers said "Yes". At least 50% of the principals checked (1) more fatigue and stress, (2) more problems going home, (3) less remedial work, (4) fewer extra-curricular activities, (5) worse school spirit, (6) too much work, (7) too little play, (8) less integration of Special Education students, and (9) less motivation for older children to learn HL/BC. The majority of the teachers checked (1) more fatigue and stress, (2) fewer extra-curricular activities, and (3) less time spent in the library.

The parents were much less likely to answer "Yes" to this question (24% to 52%). The CC parents who answered in the affirmative were most likely to say the effects were (1) more fatigue and stress, (2) more problems going home, and (3) more disruptions of out-of-school activities such as music lessons. The HL/BC and HL & CC parents who answered in the affirmative were most likely to check (1) more multicultural friendships, (2) better relationships with adults, (3) more chances to excel, (4) more self-confidence, (5) more pride in heritage, (6) more motivation for young children to learn HL/BC, (7) more academic motivation, (8) better ability to think, (9) more chances to learn languages other than HL's, and (10) more likely to think HL's and BC's are important.

Comments from one principal are divided:

I can give you two examples of good effects. One child who was experiencing problems in the regular class has experienced increased self-confidence in her heritage language class. Another child who has severe emotional problems has found that copying Chinese characters has provided her with something to do.

However, the loss of remedial time for some children has serious effects. The teachers did use it profitably.

The After-4 program is gone, because I do not have the energy to supervise it. The activities are in the concurrent program, anyway. (Principal)

The following are more examples of the many, many opinions the investigators heard about the effects of the I/E day on the children:

We are not worried about our children missing sports. Heritage Languages are more important than sports. Girls in grades four and five do not miss sports. (HL parents)

No sports are a real loss for kids. Kids need positive opportunities to use leisure time; it results in less vandalism. It

teaches discipline. It teaches spirit and positive attitudes. The system will eventually pay for the loss of sports.
(Administrator)

Losing extra-curricular activities is a shame. The teachers may never go back to it.
(Administrative Assistant)

We lost all sports, house leagues, clubs and remedial work. (Principal)

The day is far too long. The kids fall asleep at their desks. I let them sleep.
(Teacher)

The kids used to go to day care from 7:30 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. The I/E day is actually shorter. (HL parent)

The kids are not so tired now. Most used to take after-school Greek for three hours.
(HL parent)

I don't mind my child staying longer in school because he doesn't seem tired. He still has lots of energy. (CC parent)

I had an opportunity to teach four grade 8 classes during the last period of the day. They all had the "we've had it" attitude. They were just saturated with learning. They had reached an instructional overload.
(Vice-Principal)

Integration of heritage languages means kids come more regularly. (HL Instructor)

Some school yard ghettoization is occurring.
(Principal)

A Chinese child has an identity problem. He wants to be a Canadian, but his parents want him in heritage language class. He is creating problems for everyone. He is sitting in the office right now. (Teacher)

Five years ago, ethnic kids were called names. Now, they are accepted more. Ethnic kids are now going to love their roots and their new country. (HL parent)

The program has done a lot in terms of integrating the kids. There are now fewer fights in the school yards and no more prejudice in the school. The atmosphere here is completely different this year. This is a

big achievement and a step in the right direction. (BC parent)

My grade 8 son is no longer ashamed of his culture. He is more assertive. (HL parent)

With the introduction of the I/E day program, kids are more open with the language at home and in public. There are also fewer cultural conflicts. (HL parent)

There is lots of positive feedback from the children. There is better communication at home. Children are becoming closer to their parents. They have a sense of pride about their culture. (HL parent)

Does the I/E Day Affect the Community and Parents
Differently From the Regular Day?
(Tables B8 and B9)

The majority of the principals, administrative assistants and teachers answered "Yes" to this question. In contrast, the parents' opinions were more divided.

As a whole, the three groups of regular school staff saw the effects on community and parents mostly in terms of (1) more jobs in schools for adults, (2) less cooperation among parents, (3) less respect and understanding among parents, and (4) worse understanding between regular teachers and parents.

The CC parents who felt there are different effects due to the I/E day (44%) were most likely to check (1) more positive parent involvement in school and (2) more concern for safety of children.

The HL/BC and HL & CC parents who answered "Yes" to this question (33% - 43%) most frequently reported the effects to be (1) more positive parent involvement in school, (2) better understanding of parents' roles with respect to schools, and (3) better parent self-confidence. Here are some quotations that illustrate these themes:

The communication between teachers and parents has broken down. The mistrust between them has increased. It is not as open as before. Now parents don't trust what the teachers say. It is not a healthy atmosphere. (HL parent)

The damage between parents and teachers is worse than that between parents who support the I/E day and those who oppose it. (HL parent)

The I/E day causes problems between teachers

and parents. I feel uncomfortable discussing heritage languages with parents for fear of being labelled as prejudiced. (Teacher)

The four heritage language parent committees in my school meet separately. (Principal)

Parents are becoming more and more involved. (Principal)

I like the involvement of parents in the concurrent program. If we don't like the content, we are allowed to give input. We can participate in instructors' interviews and have a lot to say. (CC parent)

The interface between parents and the TBE could be stronger. It should be easier for parents to approach the Board. For the heritage language program, parent initiative is essential at first, but then the school looks after it and the parents withdraw. (HL parent)

Does the I/E Day Affect the Regular Staff
Differently From the Regular Day?
(Tables B10 and B11)

Principals/vice-principals, teachers and administrative assistants are in almost complete agreement that the I/E day does affect them differently from the regular day. Of 29 possible effects listed on the questionnaire, the following ten were checked by the largest proportions of respondents across the three groups:

- (1) More supervision duties for principal/vice-principals.
- (2) More supervision duties for administrative assistants.
- (3) More fatigue/stress for principals/vice-principals.
- (4) More fatigue/stress for teachers.
- (5) More fatigue/stress for administrative assistants.
- (6) More work for principals/vice-principals.
- (7) More work for administrative assistants.
- (8) More work for caretakers.
- (9) Less access to principal.
- (10) Lower morale.

In addition, 88% of the principals/vice-principals felt that the I/E day makes it more difficult to perform regular duties and results in more pressures from unions.

The following comments from regular school staff elaborate on these points:

My number of "contact people" has increased to 78 and does not stay as the same people all year. I am not really resistant to changes; I just want preservation. We don't

have policies for change. (Principal)

A lot of discipline problems come into the office. We have to babysit because the principal may be gone and the teachers are not involved. Sometimes we have to look for kids, as the regular teachers and instructors do not communicate, so kids skip out. (Administrative Assistant)

We have numerous interruptions. The instructors send the kids to the office for supplies, stencils, materials and information. We can't concentrate on the important jobs. (Administrative Assistant)

When I first came to the Toronto Board several years ago, there was great spirit. Now there is confrontation, and morale is poor. (Teacher)

The morale of the teachers is at an all time low. We feel let down by our employer and abused by the newspapers. We should not have to undergo such a barrage of insults. (Teacher)

The principal constantly has to patrol the school and check to see that things are running properly. (Teacher)

The supervision guidelines are not clear. Should teachers stay until the end of the day? TTF says teachers are not to be involved. This means the principal must do the supervising. What if there was an accident? Who is responsible? In this school, I get lots of help with supervision from the teachers because they care. (Principal)

The absenteeism of the teachers is 20% more than last year. I have never had teachers come up to me before and say they wanted time off because of the compaction and pressure. They are tired, not just physically, but psychologically as well. (Principal)

There are more disruptions and discipline problems now with a small enrolment of 400 kids than in the days when we had portables to accommodate many more kids. (Teacher)

The caretakers have more work and complain. During heritage language period, all hell breaks loose. The rooms at 4 p.m. are a mess, with papers, paint and glue all over the place. (Teacher)

Principals have many more people to deal with. Everyone wants things done right away. It is a severe intrusion of time, and other things such as TPR, CIP, the gifted program, pilot programs and guidance get neglected. Home life is affected because of the extra work load. The emergencies never seem to end. (Principal)

Does the I/E Day Affect the School
Differently from the Regular Day?
(Tables B12 and B13)

This question was asked of regular staff followed by a list of 22 possible effects they could check.

At least 80% of the principals/vice-principals, teachers and administrative assistants agreed that the I/E day does affect the school differently, and they checked the following five effects most frequently:

- (1) Fewer interschool activities.
- (2) More interruptions to teaching time.
- (3) Harder to plan regular classes.
- (4) Less use of sports facilities.
- (5) Harder to schedule regular classes.

In addition, 90% of the administrative assistants reported more disorientation; at least 75% of the principals indicated that it is more difficult to schedule ESL, French and to schedule in K-6 schools; and at least 66% of the teachers reported there is worse overall discipline and that it is harder to schedule for discipline time.

The following are a small sample of the difficulties outlined for the investigators during the interviews with the regular staff:

Everything has to be scheduled around the heritage language program. Field trips can't be scheduled on those days. (Teacher)

Each kid has an average of four withdrawals; six, including recesses; and ten, including music, Learning Centre, speech class and physical education. The HL class is another withdrawal. (Teacher)

The flow and continuity is lost during the I/E day. It takes time to build up a theme and get students to open up. Then, just as the students are warmed up, they are interrupted to go to HL class. (Teacher)

The ESL (English as a Second Language) kids come to me from three different classes. Therefore, timetabling is very complicated. (Teacher)

The concurrent class uses the computer room, so we do not get as much access to the computers. The HL kids get less access than the CC kids. The Special Education kids should have more access. (Teacher)

The day is broken up. Grade one kids need time together for continuity, flow and caring. Regrouping is daunting for young kids. (Teacher)

The Special Education teachers are set apart in terms of timetabling. It is very complicated; we must consider heritage language classes, regular classes, integration, bussing, gym and French. (Teacher)

The swimming pool is not being used. (CC parent)

I am upset that Special Education kids do not get a chance at the full range of concurrent activities. My child has to stay in Special Education class and gets no chance at drama, photography and journalism. (Parent)

There is more mobility in the school, and this causes discipline problems as the kids are not always accompanied by staff. At the end of the school day, when HL and CC classes are dismissed, the discipline problems flow out all over the school. (Vice-principal)

The total time for teaching core curriculum is fragmented into 10 or 15 minute periods. It is not only difficult to teach a lesson in this amount of time, but it is also difficult for pupils to learn efficiently when continuity is lacking. (Teacher)

Because of the HL classes in the afternoon, morning and afternoon Kindergarten classes do not involve the same amount of time. (Teacher)

We can no longer keep the kids at the end of the day to finish work or to discipline them. The kids know this and are taking advantage of it. They are getting away from working. (Teacher)

Working and Social Accommodations Between the Teachers
and Instructors in the I/E Day Schools
(Table B14)

Principals/vice-principals, teachers and the three groups of instructors were asked to evaluate the working and social accommodations between the teachers and instructors. Not many strong, common themes can be found across the five sets of responses, probably because the accommodations vary from school to school and even from individual to individual. As a consequence, the responses of each group will be considered separately.

Principals/Vice-principals

Over 60% feel that the accommodations are good with respect to: (1) using office space, (2) using projectors, (3) using office equipment, and (4) using classroom furniture.

Teachers

The majority (62%) feel that the communication between teachers and instructors about course content is poor. One lead instructor expressed it this way:

There is a need for the regular teachers to meet with the instructors to have formal exchanges about lesson plans so that there is no overlap and so that the two complement each other. But the instructors are not paid for this extra time, and the regular teachers do not consider the instructors to be "teachers". (Lead Instructor)

Some other comments were:

All the "fun" things that teachers used to like to use to round off a unit or a day are now done in concurrent classes. There is no coordination. It is like introducing a second school; it causes duplication and loss of activities. (Principal)

There is not much interaction with the instructors. We have had only one meeting together. The program and instructors are a separate entity. The instructors speak their own languages. (Teacher)

The instructors and teachers should work together on the kids' problems. There should be one staff member responsible for each instructor. All must work together for the benefit of the kids. (Principal)

Lead Instructors

Over 60% feel that the accommodations are good with respect to: (1) organizing concerts and festivals, (2) using school space in general, (3) using staff room space, (4) using office space, (5) using bulletin boards, and (6) using office equipment; but poor with respect to: (1) communicating about course content, (2) communicating about school activities, and (3) meeting together formally.

HL Instructors

Over 60% feel that the accommodations are good with respect to: (1) organizing concerts and festivals, (2) using school space in general, (3) using classroom space, (4) using staff room space, (5) using office space, (6) using office equipment, (7) using classroom furniture, (8) maintenance and housekeeping duties, and (9) using school supplies; but poor with respect to meeting together formally.

The following elaborate on these data and illustrate how accommodations vary by school:

The HL instructor shares my classroom and is very cooperative. There is a nice relationship between us. (Teacher)

Teachers are open to the idea of sharing classrooms, but expect things to be left in place. (Teacher)

Every Friday is "treat" day. The instructors join the regular staff in the staff room. Everyone takes turns bringing in the treats. (Principal)

I get good cooperation from the teacher. When I am short of paper and other supplies, she lets me use hers. She also lets me have one corner of the cupboard and bulletin board. (HL Instructor)

The regular teacher's materials are on the blackboard. The HL instructor leaves them and writes around them. (Researcher's observation)

The HL class is conducted in the regular teacher's classroom. The regular teacher stays at her desk on her own work. It seems to be working well. (Researcher's observation).

The regular teacher and I cooperate. We have common goals. Our two programs complement each other. (HL Instructor).

I share a classroom with an instructor. There are few problems. They are nice people. I wait for the instructor to come to my classroom and get set up. I don't stay in the class. I take my materials and work in another place. I don't mind. However, there is very little formal interaction between the teachers and the instructors. There is no structured time for it. (Teacher)

Sharing my classroom with the instructor makes me feel like a lodger. The instructor uses three-quarters of the cupboard space and a large amount of the display area. (Teacher)

Sharing my classroom inconveniences me. The spare period is wasted because I don't have access to my classroom. I don't feel comfortable going back to the classroom during the HL period. The staffroom is too noisy to do preparation there. (Teacher)

The regular teacher is in the classroom during my HL class. He has even invited someone to come in and chat during the class. The kids then think that the HL class is not as important as the regular class. (HL Instructor)

Having to share a classroom is a major concern. I am tense all the time, worrying that things may get broken. I have to be a policeman, instead of a teacher. The fact that I can't relax makes the kids feel tense as well. (HL Instructor)

I can't organize the classroom the way I would like because it is not my classroom. The lack of freedom to decorate the classroom is a problem. I can't make it "personal". (HL Instructor)

The principal in this school provides opportunities for teachers and instructors to get together, so I get a chance to talk to the regular teachers. The principal here is supportive and makes me feel relaxed. As a result, I can teach better. But things are so different in another school. There, I feel like a guest. I have very little interaction with the regular teachers. I think twice before asking for help in the office. They don't respond right away and make me feel as if I am bothering them all the time. (HL Instructor)

Teachers are concerned about storage space for HL/BC/CC classes; they are resentful. A portable trolley might help. Rooms and cupboards should be shared. They are TBE property. (HL Instructor)

The instructor has carried her materials into the classroom in a plastic tub.
(Researcher's observation)

Things have been missing from my classroom after the CC class. The physical state of the room is bad. (Teacher)

The instructors are not involved with the regular teachers. They feel marginalized.
(Parent)

My schedule is hectic. I have to teach in another school right after the class in this school. I don't have time to talk to the regular teachers. (HL Instructor)

CC Instructors

Over 60% feel that the accommodations are good with respect to (1) using school space in general, (2) using classroom space, (3) using staff room space, (4) using office space, (5) using tape recorders, (6) using office equipment, and (7) using classroom furniture.

How Should Principals and Vice-Principals React to the I/E Day? (Table B15)

The principals and vice-principals alone were presented with this question, and a glance at the percentages who responded in the affirmative to the ten items indicates considerable support on their part for the I/E day and related concepts. At least 50%, and as many as 88%, believe they should: (1) encourage children to study HL's and BC, (2) encourage instructors to integrate, (3) be willing to learn about other cultures, (4) encourage parents to enrol children in HL's and BC, (5) trust other groups, (6) treat all children the same, (7) be willing to work on solving problems, (8) be receptive to the changes, and (9) be willing to help instructors.

Here are some comments the principals made during the interviews:

I hold regular meetings with the HL and CC instructors once a month to talk about concerns. I try to work things out.
(Principal)

I try to introduce the instructors to the

regular teachers on their first day at school. I also give extra encouragement to some pupils who dislike HL to enrol in the classes. (Principal)

Both the students and the instructors need some positive stroking. This is what I do during the HL period. (Principal)

I try to influence the teaching styles of the instructors. (Principal)

I am determined to make the program work. (Principal)

How Do Principals and Vice-Principals
React to the I/E Day?
(Table B16)

The perceptions of the other nine groups of respondents concerning how the principals and vice-principals actually do react to the I/E day vary considerably. Whereas the lead instructors, HL instructors, CC instructors and administrative assistants primarily see the principals reacting as the principals themselves say they should (see above), the teachers, CC parents and UI parents are less likely to see it that way.

Two HL instructors had the following to say about how principals react to the I/E day:

The positive environment created by the principal helps. It makes things easier for the instructors. The positive attitude carries over to the teachers; as a result, many of the grades one and two students attend my HL class. (HL Instructor)

All the principals are nice. They get me the materials I want. (HL Instructor)

How Should Teachers React to the I/E Day?
(Table B17)

The teachers alone were presented with this question, and, as the percentages show, they are moderately supportive of the I/E day and related concepts. They are most likely to feel (over 70%) that they should: (1) be willing to learn about other cultures, (2) treat all children the same, and (3) be willing to work on solving problems. They are least inclined to say (31%) they should encourage parents to enrol children in HL's and BC classes.

How Do Teachers React to the I/E Day?
(Table B18)

The other nine groups feel the teachers are somewhat less supportive of the I/E day and related concepts than the teachers report themselves to be. It is interesting that, of the ten items, the other groups are most likely to say the teachers: (1) are willing to learn about other cultures (33% - 56%), (2) treat all children the same (41% - 70%), and (3) are willing to work on solving problems (36% - 73%).

The following are comments from persons who perceive the teachers as unsupportive of the I/E day program:

The teachers are telling the students they will lose their English and French if they take heritage languages. (HL parent)

Teachers are allowing kids to miss HL classes and not informing the parents. (HL parent)

If the parents are against the teachers, things will be very bad. The trust has to come back. If the teachers accept the I/E day, the parents' trust will come back. We all need to be wiser to recover from the problems. In the future, we need to be more careful. The groups are split now. (HL parent)

The kids pick up the tensions. (HL parent)

The teachers do not understand the program. They lack information. TTF is against those who support the program. The teachers are not rolling with the times. (Administrator)

The regular teachers do not welcome the CC program. As a result, there is no parental interest in it. (CC Instructor)

The teachers put the blame on the HL class when the students perform poorly in their other subjects. (Lead Instructor)

Opinions About the HL and BC Instructors
(Table B19)

Principals/vice-principals; teachers; lead, HL and BC instructors; and parents were asked for their opinions about the HL and BC instructors. Before discussing the results, it is important to note that no BC instructors responded, just 5 BC parents responded, and the teachers and UI parents mostly expressed no opinions.

Principals/vice-principals and lead instructors agree (over

60% each) that the HL and BC instructors are committed and enthusiastic, cooperate well with parents, and are good role models for the children. Lead instructors also feel (over 60%) that the HL and BC instructors are good resource personnel for regular school staff and communicate well with parents and children. The HL instructors themselves wholeheartedly agree with these five points and also say they know and understand the children. BC parents support these opinions; however, HL and HL & CC parents display only moderate support.

Lead instructors and HL instructors report (over 60%) that HL and BC instructors experience pressure to motivate children and experience pressure to prove themselves. Further, lead instructors say (over 60%) that the HL and BC instructors must try to please too many groups, and the turnover rate is too high. Finally, HL instructors (over 60%) say they need time to adjust to the Toronto Board and are willing to do volunteer work with children.

Some quotations from the interviews are informative and elaborate on these statistics:

Some of the HL instructors delight the pupils. There are some nice things happening in the HL classes. (Teacher)

I am impressed by the calibre of the instructors working here. Their dedication is far beyond the call of duty. They put in so much work for so little pay, and they have to work in an environment that is against the I/E day. (Lead Instructor)

The pupils feel comfortable with me. They sometimes come to see me and talk to me about their personal problems. (HL Instructor)

One HL instructor has volunteered to teach an extra one-half hour of the language. (Principal)

From the instructors' point of view, the pay is unfair. They quit after finding better jobs. Consequently, there are always new instructors. The high turnover rate causes a lot of disruptions to the HL classes. (Vice-principal)

The students can leave the HL/BC classes any time, so there is a lot of pressure on instructors to keep them motivated. (HL Instructor)

The HL instructors understand the language and culture of the children and communicate the children's concerns and problems to the regular teachers. (Lead Instructor)

The HL instructors make good role models for the children. The pupils can identify with adults who are of the same ethnic background.
(Lead Instructor)

Opinions About the CC Instructors
(Table B20)

Principals/vice-principals; teachers; lead and CC instructors; and parents were asked for their opinions about the CC instructors. First, it is important to note that the teachers and three groups of parents mostly expressed no opinions.

Principals/vice-principals are most likely (over 60%) to say the CC instructors are committed and enthusiastic, are good role models for the children and cooperate well with parents. Lead instructors (over 60%) mostly describe the CC instructors as good resource personnel for regular school staff and as committed and enthusiastic but say they must try to please too many groups and have a high turnover rate.

The CC instructors themselves (over 60%) say they are committed and enthusiastic, understand and know the children, are good role models for the children and are good resource personnel for regular school staff.

Information About the HL/BC/CC Programs
in The I/E Day Schools
(Tables B21, B22 and B23)

Do regular school staff, instructors and parents feel well informed about the HL/BC/CC programs in the I/E day schools? At least 50% of five groups of respondents said "Yes" - principals/vice-principals (88%), lead instructors (83%), HL instructors (73%), administrative assistants (50%), and HL & CC parents (57%). However, the other five groups do not feel so well informed.

Across all ten groups of respondents, principals/vice-principals, teachers and HL/BC/CC instructors are most likely to be named as the sources of any information respondents may possess. However, it is also interesting to note that quite a few parents (21% - 43%) and teachers (34%) named children as their sources of information.

Other patterns of information flow can also be detected by examining Table B22: (1) Toronto Board Administrators to principals and lead instructors, (2) the SCR department to administrative assistants, (3) the Toronto Teachers' Federation to principals and teachers, (4) the administrative assistants to each other and lead instructors, and (5) parents to principals and HL instructors.

Respondents were then asked to check from a list of 15 topics, those about which they would like more information. Taking each group in turn, the topics checked by 50% or more of

the respondents are as follows:

- Principals/
Vice-principals - Financing/budgets
- Teachers - Instructors' qualifications
 - Financing/budgets
 - Methods of instruction
 - Curriculum
- Administrative
Assistants - Goals
 - The process of decision making
 - Instructors' qualifications
 - Curriculum
- Lead Instructors - Goals
 - Disadvantages
 - Theory of language learning
 - The policy of the Toronto Board
 - The role of HELACON
 - The process of decision making
 - Materials used
 - Instructors' qualifications
 - Financing/budgets
 - Research on bilingual education
 - The position of the TTF
 - The role of the local school
 liaison committees
 - Methods of instruction
- HL Instructors - Theory of language learning
 - Materials used
 - Research on bilingual education
 - Methods of instruction
- CC Parents - Methods of instruction
- HL & CC Parents - Methods of instruction

The following quotations are interesting:

I am not well informed about the HL curriculum. I feel helpless, as I can't tell what is going on in the different languages.
(Principal)

Most parents do not know very much. They feel confused. They don't know what to do or who to speak to. They are always referred to the TBE rules, guidelines, etc. etc. How much money is being spent? The regular teachers need money; where does the extra money for heritage languages come from? What about the curriculum next year? Will the same things be repeated? What are the long-term plans? We don't know what the

regular teachers think. (CC parent)

I don't get enough information about the CC program. I would like a written format of what is being taught. I want information about the whole year's agenda and program. (CC parent)

The instructors seem to have different teaching and discipline methods. We don't understand them. The funds seem to come from a mysterious source. Where does this significant amount of money come from? Parents don't know what is going on; there is a lack of parent involvement. (Principal)

The teachers probably don't oppose the I/E day so much, but the communication between the parents and teachers has broken down. (HL parent)

It has been difficult the past year to understand information about the HL/BC programs, as there has been a barrage of information from many camps supporting different views. Some of the research literature has been misrepresented. (Principal)

Conflict About the HL/BC/CC Programs
in the I/E Day Schools
(Tables B24, B25 and B26)

Regular school staff (72% - 90%) and instructors (59% - 100%) are in general agreement that conflict exists about the HL/BC/CC programs in the I/E day schools. The beliefs about the sources of conflict vary from group to group. However, 83% of the Lead Instructors believe the Toronto Teachers' Federation is a source, 70% of the administrative assistants name trustees and over 60% of the principals name both trustees and the School Community Relations Department.

Who should be trying to resolve the conflict? Again, opinions vary from group to group. However, the majority of the principals/vice-principals named Toronto Board administrators, the Toronto Teachers' Federation and the Ministry of Education; the majority of the teachers named Toronto Board Administrators; the majority of the administrative assistants named Toronto Board administrators; the majority of the Lead Instructors named trustees and the Toronto Teachers' Federation; and the majority of the HL Instructors named Toronto Board administrators.

Parents are much less likely (12% - 51%) to consider that conflict exists in the I/E day schools.

Responsibilities of Principals and Vice-Principals
in the I/E Day Schools
(Tables B27 and B28)

All 16 principals/vice-principals indicated that their responsibilities in the I/E school day are different from those in a regular school day. They were then presented with a list of 28 kinds of responsibilities and asked to check whether each was more or less in the I/E day. Every item was checked as "more" by 50% or more of the respondents. The following ten items were checked by 100% of the principals/vice-principals.

- (1) More night meetings.
- (2) More individual parent meetings.
- (3) More supervision.
- (4) More negotiating between groups and individuals.
- (5) More timetabling.
- (6) More interviewing and hiring.
- (7) More provision of moral support.
- (8) More paperwork.
- (9) More telephone communication.
- (10) More rearranging of space.

Three principals described their additional responsibilities as follows:

There has been a 30% - 40% increase in my work load. (Principal)

I try to be available to many people. It is difficult to plan anything else. I must put out a lot of fires, cover for absent instructors, deal with keys, consider class lists, look after tape recorders, etc. etc. I must delay work on CIP, TPR, ABC and newsletters. I neglect the regular teachers. Priorities are ill-defined. (Principal)

This program has almost tripled the time required of the principal. On heritage language day, I have a heavy burden. I am exhausted and am neglecting other responsibilities. It is very time-consuming. (Principal)

Responsibilities of Administrative Assistants
in the I/E Day Schools
(Tables B29 and B30)

All 10 administrative assistants indicated that their responsibilities in the I/E school day are different from those in the regular school day. They were then presented with a list of 41 kinds of responsibilities and asked to check whether each was more or less in the I/E day. At least 60% of the respondents checked "more" for 37 of the items. The following nine were checked by 90% or 100% of the administrative assistants.

- (1) More typing.

- (2) More duplicating.
- (3) More paper work.
- (4) More telephone communication.
- (5) More payrolls.
- (6) More requisition forms.
- (7) More supplies to look after.
- (8) More interruptions to regular work.
- (9) More arrangements for translators.

Here are the details as described by two administrative assistants and comments from one lead instructor:

The work load is incredible. I must answer questions from many people. I must deal with supplies, class lists, voting, program choices, registrations and gather data about home language and place of birth. The regular teachers feel the loss of my time. I can't do the little things I used to do for the regular teachers. At the beginning, it is really difficult. I have to do a lot of extra work at home. (Administrative Assistant)

There is a great increase in activities and stress. The regular school activities cannot be completed before 4:30, so I stay late. Typing of schedules is very difficult. The class lists change almost daily because the students are allowed to switch classes. There are many extra bodies with extra problems. The lead instructor is good, but still an extra body; I must train her. She gets paid more than I do; it is unfair. I can't keep up with the work, and I am very tired. My social life is going down the drain, and I am making more errors. (Administrative Assistant)

The administrative assistant has a heavy work load. I feel I should take over some of this work load, but I spend most of my time substituting for instructors who are absent. (Lead Instructor)

Duties of Local School Lead Instructors
(Tables B31, B32 and B33)

Local school lead instructor positions were established in September 1984 to assist the principal with both heritage and concurrent programs in an Integrated/Extended day. An excerpt from the Integrated/Extended Day Heritage and Concurrent Programs Operations Manual (see Appendix F) reads as follows:

The Principal may hire a lead-instructor for the Heritage and Concurrent Programs in each

Integrated/Extended Day school to assist him or her in such duties as purchasing of supplies, record-keeping, supervision of students, scheduling of occasional instructors and where necessary to substitute in classes for instructors in their absence.
(p.7)

In this survey, the school lead instructors, principals, administrative assistants and HL/BC/CC instructors were asked to submit in an open-ended format a list of ways in which the school lead instructors help in the I/E day schools.

Help For the Principals and Vice-principals

In addition to the duties outlined in the Operations Manual, several principals and vice-principals described the school lead instructors' duties as:

- (1) program planning, integration and research,
- (2) timetabling/organizing,
- (3) help in hiring instructors,
- (4) liaising with regular staff,
- (5) liaising with parents, and
- (6) interacting with instructors.

The school lead instructors themselves emphasized:

- (1) liaising with regular staff,
- (2) liaising with parents,
- (3) assisting in classrooms, and
- (4) assisting in evening programs and school-community activities.

Help For the Administrative Assistants

The administrative assistants provided a long list of ways in which the local school lead instructors help them, although it lacks strong agreement in any one area. Included in the list are such diverse activities as ordering supplies, making class lists, unlocking classrooms, translating, moral support, and locating missing students. The five lead instructors themselves provided a much shorter list but particularly emphasized paper work for TBE and Ministry, attendance keeping, supplies, and Xeroxing.

Help For the HL/BC/CC Instructors

The responses clearly indicate that the local school lead instructors help both HL and CC instructors in a wide variety of ways. Across the three groups of instructors, mention was most frequently made of:

- (1) supplies,
- (2) liaising with regular staff,
- (3) classroom management and discipline,
- (4) programming, etc.,
- (5) assisting instructors, and
- (6) informing instructors.

While this survey was being analyzed, the position of local

school lead instructor was revised and on February 12, 1986, the following recommendations were passed:

1. That in recognition of the facts that the Local School Lead-Instructors serve both the Heritage and Concurrent programs and that they provide closely related program and administrative assistance, the word "school" in the title be replaced by "HELACON Program" and the full title become "Local HELACON Program Lead-Instructor."
2. That the responsibilities of the HELACON Program Lead-Instructor be as follows:

To assist the Principal in the supervision of Heritage, Black Cultural and Concurrent Program and with administrative duties as follows:

PROGRAM

- classroom program management and planning, e.g. materials, themes, activities, guest speakers, special events, extra-curricular activities.
- instructional methodology.
- co-ordination of audio and visual aids.
- occasional instructor as needed.

ADMINISTRATION

- (a) Preparation of records:
 - registration and attendance of pupils and instructors.
 - related reports.
- (b) Liaison among Heritage and Concurrent Instructors and regular teaching and support staff.
- (c) Liaison with parents:
 - attend meetings of and prepare reports for liaison committees,
 - contact parents re Heritage and Concurrent programs.
- (d) Assistance to instructors in the ordering of supplies.

- (e) Assistance in the selection process of instructors, as is appropriate.
- (f) Arranging for occasional instructors.
- (g) Hall and classroom management.
- (h) Other duties related to Heritage and Concurrent Programs and determined by the principal.

(p.28)

Duties of Language Lead Instructors
(Tables B34 and B35)

The Integrated/Extended Day Heritage and Concurrent Programs Operations Manual (see Appendix F) states:

Where number of classes warrant, a language lead-instructor is hired by the Heritage Languages Department to act as a resource person for specific languages in classes across the city.

(p.9)

The language lead instructors and the HL instructors were asked to list ways in which the former helps the latter. Unfortunately, just one lead instructor returned an answered questionnaire. However, 11 HL instructors responded and most frequently described the help as related to:

- (1) supplies,
- (2) programming and curriculum,
- (3) information,
- (4) ideas and suggestions, and
- (5) help with discipline.

Role of Parents in the I/E Day Schools
(Table B36)

Generally speaking, principals/vice-principals, HL instructors and the four groups of parents judge parents to be more willing than qualified to assist in hiring instructors, planning programs and evaluating programs in the I/E day schools.

CC instructors either did not respond or checked "Don't Know".

Involvement of Parents in I/E Day Schools
(Tables B37 and B38)

Parents alone were asked whether their involvement with the schools had changed with the introduction of the I/E day. When divided into the four groups, no majority response is obvious, although parents (with the exception of the HL & CC group) are most likely to say "Don't Know". The HL & CC parents are most

likely to say "No" (34%).

Those who answered "Yes" to the question (14% - 29%) were then asked to examine a list of 21 possible changes in parent involvement and to check those that applied. The following seven items received the largest proportions of checks across the four parent groups:

- (1) More planning of programs.
- (2) More attending of meetings.
- (3) More communication with principals/vice-principals.
- (4) More communication with regular teachers.
- (5) More communication with instructors.
- (6) More communication with other parents.
- (7) More written communication.

During interviews with the other groups, lack of parent involvement was frequently mentioned as a concern. The following comments are examples:

My relationship with the parents is good when the parents come in, but I have very little contact with them. (HL Instructor)

I am disappointed that the parents of the various language groups are not showing up. Is this being picked up by the kids? (Lead Instructor)

I made the proposal and all the decisions about the concurrent program and took them to the Area Office. No concurrent parents showed up at the meeting. (CC Instructor)

There is a lack of parent involvement. Kids may not want to go to the heritage language classes. Parents don't know what is going on. (Principal)

It is difficult to communicate with parents. They have to work. We need to talk to the parents more. (HL Instructor)

What Changes Should Be Made if the Programs Continue?
(Tables B39, B40 and B41)

Based on an assumption that the HL, BC and CC programs continue in the I/E day schools, the ten groups of respondents were asked to indicate changes that should be made. A long list was presented and respondents were asked to check one or more. The most frequently checked responses are presented individually for each group.

Principals and Vice-principals

- The following changes were checked by 40% or more:
- (1) Put French in CC (concurrent programs).

- (2) Put computers in CC.
- (3) Do remedial work in CC.
- (4) Have regular teachers do CC programs with pay.
- (5) Sort out priorities at the Toronto Board.
- (6) Have HL/BC programs partly funded by parents.
- (7) Improve curriculum guidelines for instructors.
- (8) More emphasis on Canadian culture in HL/BC/CC programs.
- (9) Pay instructors to get more training.
- (10) Pay instructors for parent interviews/meetings.
- (11) Pay lead instructors more.
- (12) Provide more in-service and professional development for instructors.
- (13) Pay principals more in I/E day schools.
- (14) Pay vice-principals more in I/E day schools.
- (15) Give all I/E day schools a vice-principal.
- (16) Pay administrative assistants more in I/E day schools.
- (17) Provide more clerical help in I/E day schools.
- (18) Better delineation of policy regarding supervision.
- (19) Provide in-service for lead instructors.
- (20) Provide funding for HL/BC/CC curriculum development.
- (21) Make Toronto Board consultants available to instructors.
- (22) More commitment from Board administrators.
- (23) Improve substitution procedures for instructors.
- (24) Decrease paperwork.
- (25) Familiarize instructors with child development theory.
- (26) Familiarize instructors with teaching methods of TBE.
- (27) Familiarize instructors with effective classroom management techniques.

Teachers

The following changes were checked by 40% or more:

- (1) Sort out priorities at the Toronto Board.
- (2) Have HL/BC programs partly funded by parents.
- (3) More emphasis on Canadian culture in HL/BC/CC programs.
- (4) Hire only instructors with Ontario teaching certificates.
- (5) Pay principals more in I/E day schools.
- (6) Give all I/E day schools a vice-principal.
- (7) Provide more clerical help in I/E day schools.

Administrative Assistants

The following changes were checked by 40% or more:

- (1) Have regular teachers do CC programs with pay.
- (2) Do more long range planning.
- (3) Sort out priorities at the Toronto Board.
- (4) Have HL/BC programs partly funded by parents.
- (5) Better overall organization.
- (6) Hire only instructors with Ontario teaching certificates.
- (7) Pay principals more in I/E day schools.
- (8) Pay vice-principals more in I/E day schools.
- (9) Give all I/E day schools a vice-principal.
- (10) Pay administrative assistants more in I/E day schools.
- (11) Provide more clerical help in I/E day schools.
- (12) Prepare administrative assistants better.
- (13) Prepare regular teaching staff better.
- (14) Increase familiarity and awareness of trustees.

- (15) Increase familiarity and awareness of Board administrators.
- (16) Better define the role of lead instructors.
- (17) More commitment from Board administrators.
- (18) More commitment from parents.

Lead Instructors

The following changes were checked by 40% or more:

- (1) Put computers in CC programs.
- (2) Do cross-cultural studies in CC.
- (3) Do more long range planning.
- (4) Make HL/BC/CC programs more uniform by school.
- (5) Improve procedures for ordering HL, BC and CC supplies.
- (6) Sort out priorities at the Toronto Board.
- (7) Better overall organization.
- (8) More creativity in designing HL/BC/CC programs.
- (9) Improve student evaluation in HL/BC/CC programs.
- (10) Incorporate better activities into HL/BC/CC programs.
- (11) Put HL/BC/CC marks in regular report cards.
- (12) Improve curriculum guidelines for instructors.
- (13) Blend HL, BC and CC activities.
- (14) Create a resource centre for HL/BC/CC programs.
- (15) Give instructors fringe benefits.
- (16) Pay instructors to get more training.
- (17) Pay instructors for parent interviews/meetings.
- (18) Pay instructors for marking and report cards.
- (19) Pay instructors for curriculum development.
- (20) Pay lead instructors more.
- (21) Give instructors job security.
- (22) Give instructors better schedules.
- (23) Provide more in-service and professional development for instructors.
- (24) Pay principals more in I/E day schools.
- (25) Provide more clerical help in I/E day schools.
- (26) Prepare principals better in I/E day schools.
- (27) Prepare administrative assistants better.
- (28) Prepare regular teaching staff better.
- (29) Increase familiarity and awareness of trustees.
- (30) Have principals and lead instructors meet as a group.
- (31) Provide in-service for lead instructors.
- (32) Better define the role of lead instructors.
- (33) Improve administration and distribution of funds for HL/BC/CC programs.
- (34) Increase funding for supplies and materials for HL/BC/CC programs.
- (35) Have Toronto Board take more responsibility for hiring instructors.
- (36) More commitment from parents.
- (37) More support from Toronto Teachers' Federation.
- (38) Improve substitution procedures for instructors.
- (39) Familiarize instructors with child development theory.
- (40) Familiarize instructors with teaching methods of TBE.
- (41) Familiarize instructors with effective classroom management techniques.
- (42) Teach more culture in HL classes.
- (43) Teach more history and geography of homeland in HL classes.

HL Instructors

The following changes were checked by 40% or more:

- (1) Do cross-cultural studies in CC.
- (2) Provide more choices of CC program.
- (3) Do more long range planning.
- (4) Make HL/BC/CC programs more uniform by school.
- (5) Integrate more into regular program.
- (6) Give all Toronto Board schools the same additional resources.
- (7) Improve procedures for ordering HL, BC and CC supplies.
- (8) Provide a class for every heritage language in each school.
- (9) Better overall organization.
- (10) More grouping by age in HL/BC/CC programs.
- (11) More grouping by ability in HL/BC/CC programs.
- (12) Incorporate better activities into HL/BC/CC programs.
- (13) Deliver HL/BC/CC supplies on time.
- (14) Update HL/BC/CC curriculum each year.
- (15) Put HL/BC/CC marks in regular report cards.
- (16) Improve curriculum guidelines for instructors.
- (17) Make HL/BC/CC programs more equal in status.
- (18) Create a resource center for HL/BC/CC programs.
- (19) Give instructors fringe benefits.
- (20) Pay instructors to get more training.
- (21) Pay instructors for parent interviews/meetings.
- (22) Pay instructors for lesson preparation.
- (23) Pay instructors for marking and report cards.
- (24) Pay instructors for curriculum development.
- (25) Increase hourly rate of pay for instructors.
- (26) More frequent pay periods for instructors.
- (27) Give instructors job security.
- (28) Give instructors better schedules.
- (29) Provide more in-service and professional development for instructors.
- (30) Unionize the instructors.
- (31) Increase familiarity and awareness of trustees.
- (32) Increase familiarity and awareness of Board administrators.
- (33) Better define the role of lead instructors.
- (34) Provide funding for HL/BC/CC curriculum development.
- (35) Increase funding for supplies and materials for HL/BC/CC programs.
- (36) More collaboration among instructors.
- (37) More cooperation between parents and instructors.
- (38) More support from Toronto Teachers' Federation.
- (39) Familiarize instructors with effective classroom management techniques.
- (40) More reading of HL in HL classes.
- (41) More writing of HL in HL classes.
- (42) More speaking of HL in HL classes.
- (43) Teach more culture in HL classes.
- (44) Teach more history and geography of homeland in HL classes.

CC Instructors

The following changes were checked by 40% or more:

- (1) Do more long range planning.
- (2) Give all Toronto Board schools the same additional resources.
- (3) Improve procedures for ordering HL/BC/CC supplies.
- (4) Put HL/BC/CC marks in regular report cards.
- (5) Improve curriculum guidelines for instructors.
- (6) Create a resource centre for HL/BC/CC programs.
- (7) Give instructors fringe benefits.
- (8) Pay instructors to get more training.
- (9) Pay instructors for parent interviews/meetings.
- (10) Pay instructors for lesson preparation.
- (11) Pay instructors for marking and report cards.
- (12) Pay instructors for curriculum development.
- (13) Increase hourly rate of pay for instructors.
- (14) More frequent pay periods for instructors.
- (15) Give instructors more work.
- (16) Give instructors job security.
- (17) Give instructors better schedules.
- (18) Prepare regular teaching staff better.
- (19) Increase funding for supplies and materials for HL/BC/CC programs.
- (20) More collaboration among instructors.
- (21) Improve substitution procedures for instructors.
- (22) Familiarize instructors with child development theory.
- (23) Familiarize instructors with teaching methods of TBE.
- (24) Familiarize instructors with effective classroom management techniques.

HL/BC Parents

The following changes were checked by 40% or more:

- (1) Put HL/BC/CC marks in regular report cards.
- (2) More cooperation between parents and instructors.
- (3) More reading of HL in HL classes (HL parents only).
- (4) More writing of HL in HL classes (HL parents only).
- (5) More listening to HL in HL classes (HL parents only).
- (6) More speaking of HL in HL classes (HL parents only).
- (7) Teach more history and geography of homeland in HL classes (HL parents only).
- (8) Present Black culture/history more positively (BC parents only).
- (9) Teach wider variety of Black cultures (BC parents only).

CC Parents

The following changes were checked by 40% or more:

- (1) Put French in CC programs.
- (2) Put computers in CC programs.
- (3) Have Toronto Board take more responsibility for hiring instructors.
- (4) More cooperation between parents and instructors.
- (5) Familiarize instructors with child development theory.

HL & CC Parents

The following changes were checked by 40% or more:

- (1) Put French in CC programs.
- (2) Put English in CC programs.
- (3) Put computers in CC programs.
- (4) Update HL/BC/CC curriculum each year.
- (5) Put HL/BC/CC marks in regular report cards.
- (6) Pay instructors to get more training.
- (7) Provide more in-service and professional development for instructors.
- (8) Increase familiarity and awareness of Board administrators.
- (9) Provide funding for HL/BC/CC curriculum development.
- (10) Increase funding for supplies and materials for HL/BC/CC programs.
- (11) Have Toronto Board take more responsibility for hiring instructors.
- (12) More cooperation between parents and instructors.
- (13) More commitment from Board administrators.
- (14) More support from Toronto Teachers' Federation.
- (15) Familiarize instructors with child development theory.
- (16) Familiarize instructors with effective classroom management techniques.
- (17) Encourage instructors to act more professionally.
- (18) Increase regular extra curricular activities.
- (19) Provide guidelines about HL/BC/CC curriculum for parents.
- (20) More reading of HL in HL classes.
- (21) More writing of HL in HL classes.
- (22) More listening to HL in HL classes.
- (23) More speaking of HL in HL classes.
- (24) Teach more culture in HL classes.
- (25) Teach more history and geography of homeland in HL classes.

UI Parents

The following changes were checked by 40% or more:

- (1) Put French in CC programs.
- (2) Put English in CC programs.

Here are several quotations that elaborate on a few of the preceding suggestions for change in the I/E day programs:

It would be nice to have more of a curriculum. We need Canadian materials. The curriculum we get from the Board relates to teaching English as a Second Language; what we do is quite different. We have to make up our own lessons and work. (HL Instructor)

The materials we get from Portugal that are used in Portuguese schools are not always at the right level. The materials must match not only with the ages of the children but with their abilities in the Portuguese language. (HL Instructor)

The classes are too large with a wide variety of ages, interests and abilities. We need more trained instructors who have classroom experience and know how to set goals for the children. (Lead Instructor)

Materials are scarce and orders for them do not come through. Some activities are not feasible because the materials are too expensive. (HL Instructor)

I get the materials from the parents and kids who have just arrived in Canada. However, I am not happy with the political bent of some of these materials. (HL Instructor)

I get my materials sent in from India; however, they don't suit the ages of the children. I use my own money. Similar books purchased in Toronto are very expensive. (HL Instructor)

If the heritage language program is to last, it will have to be "souped" up. (Teacher)

We are not getting our money's worth. The instructors are not qualified. Many have a poor grasp of the mentality of the Canadian kids. Their teaching methods are different and it confuses the kids. The instructors should be attending seminars and FEUT. (HL parent)

The kids have drawn a line between adults they can and cannot manipulate. They feel they can manipulate the instructors. (Teacher)

There are many ages in my class. I divide them into two groups - grades 1-3 and grades 4-6. (CC Instructor)

They started mixing CC and HL classes by putting cartooning in the HL class. This decreased the kids' desire to transfer to CC class. (Parent)

My child is not in the BC class because it is Jamaican-oriented and I am not too interested in the Jamaican culture. I would prefer a Black multicultural program. (BC parent)

The money is okay this year with start-up funds, but next year may be a different story. Funding must match the requirements of the programs. (Parent)

Trustees have no idea what it is like on the front line. (Administrative Assistant)

It is good to be an Educational Assistant first. I learned a lot about Canadian methods and materials that way.
(HL Instructor)

My son has reading problems. I would like remedial work in the concurrent program with a qualified instructor. (CC parent)

At the last meeting, parents were not too happy because slavery was being taught. It causes problems instead of solving them and the presentation is not too good.
(BC parent)

I resent getting paid just once every nine weeks. (CC Instructor)

The good Portuguese Instructor has been an Educational Assistant here for years. It has helped her a lot. She picks up ideas very quickly. Her curriculum matches each grade level of the regular curriculum. (Principal)

What about teaching Canadian/British culture in the concurrent programs? (CC parent)

The computers in the concurrent program cause competition between the HL and CC programs.
(HL parent)

Need Portuguese/Canadian blended materials. The Ministry should provide more money for this. If province approves multiculturalism, they must recognize it and do something about it instead of just paying lip service.
(Vice-principal)

The TBE is weak in helping to fill instructors' positions. The effort is not coordinated. The principal becomes an employment agency - other principals phone.
(Parent)

The Board administrators and trustees rarely come out. (Principal)

I would like long term plans for curriculum development and cross cultural studies.
(Administrator)

HL Instructors' Descriptions of Children in HL Classes
(Table B42)

The HL instructors were asked to consider a list of 25 descriptors that might fit children in HL classes and to check those with which they agreed. Over 90% checked the following:

- (1) Happy
- (2) Multicultural friendships
- (3) Good relationships with instructors
- (4) Good attendance
- (5) Good self-confidence
- (6) Identify with heritage
- (7) Listen to HL well
- (8) Young children are motivated to learn HL
- (9) Older children are motivated to learn HL
- (10) Enjoy the change in pace.

Fewer than 20% checked:

- (1) Tired and stressed
- (2) Problems going home
- (3) Feel alienated.

CC Instructors' Descriptions of Children in CC Classes
(Table B43)

The CC instructors were asked to consider a list of 17 descriptors. Over 90% checked the following:

- (1) Good attendance
- (2) Are from many cultural backgrounds.

Fewer than 20% checked:

- (1) Feel alienated
- (2) Understand the purpose of CC classes.

Comparison of Integrated HL Classes
With Other Types of HL Classes
(Tables B44 and B45)

Parents with children in HL classes were asked whether the integrated classes affected their children differently from other types of heritage language classes. Responses varied; however, more said "Yes" than "No".

Of those who said "Yes", the effects most frequently checked (over 33%) were:

- (1) Better HL reading
- (2) Better HL writing
- (3) Better HL speaking
- (4) Better HL listening
- (5) Better communication with relatives
- (6) Better understanding of culture and/or religion.

Comparison of Integrated BC Classes
With Other Types of BC Classes
(Table B46)

Parents with children in BC classes were asked whether the integrated classes affected their children differently from other types of Black Cultural classes. Five BC parents returned a questionnaire, but none answered "Yes" to this question nor checked any of the eight possible effects.

Activities and Methods Used to Teach HL and CC Classes
(Table B47)

Heritage language and concurrent instructors use a wide variety of activities and methods to teach their classes. Considering both groups, the most frequently mentioned were activities and methods related to:

- (1) games and contests
- (2) music
- (3) crafts
- (4) oral communication
- (5) reading
- (6) art, and
- (7) story-telling.

The HL instructors also frequently mentioned pictures, writing and acting while the CC instructors mentioned films, exercises and "hands-on" experiences.

Materials Used to Teach HL and CC Classes
(Table B48)

The instructors use a wide variety of materials to teach HL and CC classes. Heritage language instructors most frequently listed:

- (1) books, etc.
- (2) charts, etc.
- (3) various types of paper
- (4) flash cards, etc.
- (5) audio-video equipment, and
- (6) copied materials.

Concurrent instructors most frequently mentioned:

- (1) books, etc.
- (2) audio-video equipment
- (3) colored markers
- (4) paper
- (5) pencils/pens, and
- (6) glue/paste.

Other Materials Instructors Would Like
(Table B49)

There are many additional materials instructors would like to teach HL and CC classes. However, audio-video equipment, tapes and tape recorders, books, cultural materials, and arts and

crafts materials were most frequently suggested.

During the interviews, many HL instructors and parents and teachers expressed the desirability of materials that blend the heritage cultures with the Canadian culture. And, during the classroom observations, the researchers frequently noted how the instructors used both English and the heritage language to work with the children. Consider the following:

Books that blend the Canadian and Italian cultures are best. (Italian Instructor)

Asian materials are too difficult, they are not Canadian based. (Chinese Instructor)

A flip chart is in use that displays both Chinese and English words. (Observation of a Chinese class)

The instructor disciplines the children in both English and Portuguese. (Observation of a Portuguese class)

I like to blend the Vietnamese and Canadian cultures when I teach. I point out the differences and similarities. (Vietnamese Instructor)

I Xerox the books I like that are in short supply. (Chinese Instructor)

I balance between teaching English and Chinese depending on the background of the students. (Chinese Instructor)

The Greek class is being shown a film in English and the walls of the classroom are covered with French materials. (Observation of a Greek class)

The instructor and students switch between Spanish and English. The switching is barely noticeable because it is done so quickly and with such ease. (Observation of a Spanish class)

Instructors use English to help the students learn the heritage language. This also helps the children learn English. (Lead Instructor)

Sources of Materials
(Table B50)

HL and CC instructors obtain and collect materials from quite a variety of sources, although most materials come from the TBE. Several instructors use their own personal materials and/or get materials from the parents and children. Libraries of various kinds are also favorite sources.

Centro Canadese Scuola e Cultura Italiana, the Greek Consulate in Toronto and the Chinese Lingual-Cultural Centre of Canada were frequently mentioned during the interviews as good sources of Italian, Greek and Chinese materials.

Most of the Chinese instructors were using multilevel books designed by Chinese instructors in Canada. The books are set up so that one topic may be taught at a variety of levels, and the books build on each other. For the heritage language classes that frequently contain many age levels and many degrees of language ability (even children of other language groups), the materials are invaluable.

Opinions About Regular School Programs
in Toronto Elementary Schools
(Table B51)

Respondents were asked to indicate changes they would like to see in the regular school programs in the elementary schools. They were presented with a list of 15 possible changes and asked to check one or more.

Principals/Vice-principals

60% or more would like:

- (1) more individual attention
- (2) smaller classes
- (3) more computers.

Teachers

60% or more would like:

- (1) smaller classes.

Administrative Assistants

60% or more would like:

- (1) more English
- (2) more individual attention
- (3) smaller classes.

Lead Instructors

60% or more would like:

- (1) better discipline.

HL Instructors

60% or more would like:

- (1) better discipline
- (2) more books.

CC Instructors

60% or more would like:

- (1) more individual attention
- (2) smaller classes.

HL/BC Parents

No changes were suggested by 60% or more of these parents.

CC Parents

60% or more would like:

- (1) more individual attention
- (2) better reporting to parents
- (3) more computers.

HL & CC Parents

60% or more would like:

- (1) more basics
- (2) more English
- (3) more homework
- (4) more computers.

UI Parents

No changes were suggested by 60% or more of these parents.

PUPILS IN INTEGRATED/EXTENDED DAY SCHOOLS
(Tables C1-C12)
(Appendix D)

During the exploratory phase of the study and using the methods outlined in the Introduction, the investigators interviewed 103 pupils in HL/BC classes and 59 in concurrent classes, approximately three-quarters of whom were in grades 3, 4, 5 and 6. The majority (83%) of the HL/BC pupils interviewed were enrolled in Portuguese, Chinese, Italian, Greek and Spanish heritage language classes and about 10% of the HL/BC pupils were enrolled in classes different from their actual heritage language (e.g. a Greek-speaking child enrolled in a Spanish class). The CC pupils were enrolled in a wide variety of concurrent classes ranging from karate to journalism with approximately 40% in classes associated with the arts and crafts.

HL/BC Pupils' Opinions

These pupils were all asked what language(s) they use with parents, siblings, school peers and community peers. As Table C3 indicates, English is much more likely to be used with siblings, school peers and community peers than with parents (roughly 70% vs 30%). It is also interesting to note that approximately 10% use both English and their HL in communicating with these four groups.

What do pupils like and dislike about the HL/BC classes? Pupils' likes are varied, with instructors, games, writing, reading and coloring/drawing mentioned most frequently, and 25% claimed they had no dislikes. The list of dislikes given by the others, however, has several items in it that suggest there are discipline problems in some HL/BC classes.

Most pupils offered additional solicited or unsolicited comments during the interviews. These were recorded and grouped into Table C6. Some interesting comments are:

- (1) Parents want child in HL/BC class (43%)
- (2) Pupil wants to be in HL/BC class (40%)
- (3) Learns to write HL (34%)
- (4) Learns to read HL (26%)
- (5) Learns to speak HL (21%)
- (6) There are many ages in the classes (15%)
- (7) Parent wants child to be able to communicate better with relatives (15%)
- (8) Pupil would rather be in concurrent class (15%)

Finally, many children talked about the third language they are learning; that is, French, and often stated that they liked it but were not too fluent in it. Others even mentioned being involved with a fourth language. For example, Pupil C in Appendix D is involved with English, Laotian, Chinese and French. Pupils involved with several languages often said they did not get the languages mixed up.

CC Pupils' Opinions

What do pupils like and dislike about the concurrent classes? As with the HL/BC classes (see Table C9), their likes and dislikes are varied, but at the top of the list of likes are the instructors. The most prominent theme among the dislikes is poor discipline.

Additional comments provided by CC pupils are shown in Table C12. Reference is made, among other things, to small classes and mixed ages.

The summaries of interviews in Appendix D clearly illustrate the multicultural backgrounds of pupils in CC classes and the fact that many have previously attended heritage language classes, or wish that a class existed that they could attend. It is also obvious that parents frequently allow children to make their own decisions about which classes to attend. Finally, it is interesting that several pupils said they liked the concurrent program arrangement better than the previous year, when they usually remained in the regular classrooms.

SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

Those readers who have studied the data and tables in Appendices A, B and C will realize that the main text of this report is itself a summary that highlights only the major findings of a topic that encompasses a multitude of issues. This section will therefore take the form of a more general discussion.

Nearly everyone thinks that elementary school children should learn their heritage languages and there is a general consensus on the main reasons for doing so. The reasons are:

- (1) to improve communications with relatives,
- (2) to enhance pride in heritage,
- (3) to maintain and revitalize culture and religion, and
- (4) because languages are best learned when young.

Children can be taught their heritage languages and cultures in a variety of ways - at home, after-school classes, summer classes, weekend classes, and by using them as media to learn other school subjects. Not everyone agrees on the best method. This report describes the teaching of heritage languages and cultures as part of an extended school day, a new Toronto Board program with the following unique characteristics, successes and problems.

First, it is the perception of some that the program in these fifteen schools has divided the children into two camps - Anglo-Saxon, English-speaking children enrolled in the concurrent (CC) classes versus non-Anglo-Saxon children enrolled in the heritage language and Black cultural (HL/BC) classes. Others believe it is leading to ghettoization. The data, on the contrary, indicate that the cultural makeup of these classes is very complex. Very few of the HL/BC classes are culturally homogeneous, and the CC classes tend to be quite multicultural. Some Anglo-Saxon children enrol in the HL/BC classes, some children elect not to study their HL/BC, even when a class is made available, and many families have children enrolled in both classes. The concurrent classes also contain many children from cultural groups for which HL/BC classes, because of small numbers, have not been established. Across these fifteen schools, eleven different HL/BC classes were in existence; however, the 16% of the families who responded to the questionnaire belonged to 25 cultural groups and named 21 home languages.

Second, many assume these integrated HL/BC classes can and should be designed and offered in a manner similar to that of a regular school class. That is, assumptions are made that children will progress at regular steps through material of ever-increasing difficulty and that progress will be carefully measured at various times during the year. However, the realities and circumstances surrounding the Integrated/Extended

day program mean that these classes are, in fact, very different and should be understood to be so if they are to enjoy more success. These classes are composed not only of multicultural children (as previously mentioned), but of children of many different ages, skills, dialects, language abilities and interests. For example, a Spanish class might contain several Anglo-Saxon children, a Spanish teenage boy just beginning to learn Spanish, a Kindergarten child who speaks Spanish perfectly and knows no English, a Chinese child born in Latin America who wants to maintain the Spanish she knows, and a Black child from Africa who has no Black cultural class in the school to attend. It is obviously difficult to teach such a class a series of lessons on the Spanish language and culture in a traditional manner. In order for these classes to be more successful, new kinds of goals, methods, materials, teaching aids and modes of evaluation would have to be created. The multilevel Chinese materials are good examples.

Third, there are those who maintain that the HL/BC classes distract children from learning the Canadian culture and the English language. Several findings of this study suggest that this is not likely to happen. The interviews with the children revealed that most speak English with their siblings and peers at home, in the community and in the school yard. The English media are strong influences. In fact, the children seem to be an exact reflection of their environment. They are Canadian (however defined); they use English in the greater part of their environment, and many use a heritage language with parents and grandparents.

Fourth, some feel that the HL/BC classes are best taught using the methods and materials of the homelands. Interviews with instructors, parents, teachers and principals as well as classroom observations suggest that the children tend to respond best to methods of learning and classroom materials that are a blend of the heritage cultures and languages with the Canadian culture and English language. Some instructors emphasized that materials from the homelands are not quite appropriate, many find it necessary to make some use of English in the HL classes, and many teach the classes by comparing the heritage and Canadian cultures. Unfortunately, curriculum materials that are a blend of heritage and Canadian cultures are very scarce for the use of either the instructors or the regular teachers. Such materials might help the children identify better with their learning experiences and might help confirm for them the realities of their environment. Many also feel the instructors need more training in "Canadian" methods of teaching.

Fifth, some believe that the introduction of an innovation such as the I/E day program into a school can be accomplished without the cooperation and commitment of many who must ultimately contribute if it is to be a success. The findings of the study clearly show that the I/E day program makes heavy demands on principals, vice-principals, administrative assistants, teachers and caretakers. A great deal of extra work is created. Space, materials, equipment, supplies, furniture, supervision duties, time, curriculum goals, scheduling

arrangements and the children (problems, attendance records, etc.) must be shared. Several of the regular staff (particularly the principals) have taken on these additional demands with determination and in good faith, and many even express pride in their accomplishments. These staff members have developed a "sense of ownership" in the program, and they feel committed to making it work. Consequently, it seems obvious that if regular school staff are not fully prepared, involved and committed from the very beginning, then the implementation of such a program will meet with resistance and/or be problematic.

Sixth, some believe that any adult can manage and teach a class of young children. The problems in some of the HL/BC/CC classes, particularly the CC classes, suggest that this is not the case. Teaching is a profession that requires many skills and tools, knowledge of good pedagogy and child development, and experience in classroom management techniques. While many of the instructors are committed and enthusiastic, understand the children in special ways and are frequently good role models, those who lack professional qualifications and/or experience can be at a disadvantage. Individuals who do not possess such qualifications and who have limited access to good tools should probably not be placed in classes that are so pedagogically challenging.

Seventh, the natural tendency is to think that it would be a straightforward administrative task to have some additional adults enter a school for 150 minutes a week and teach a new program. However, the findings of this study suggest otherwise. Many other matters including benefits, unionization, school space, inservice, arranging schedules among several schools and payment for out of class work time must be considered. The newly employed adults soon expect to be treated as are regular employees.

Eighth, many initially were of the opinion that the concurrent program needed only minimal attention. However, the data in this report reveal that several groups of respondents would like the concurrent program to be more sophisticated and challenging. French, English, computers, remedial work and cross-cultural studies have been suggested as possibilities for the concurrent program.

Ninth, one would naturally tend to think that a program such as the I/E day program that teaches children their heritage languages and cultures would lead to a much greater involvement of the parents in the schools. The experiences of the investigators in this study and the comments from regular staff and the instructors indicate that for most schools this is not so. While it is true that the program has lead to intense involvement for a few parents, on the whole, the majority remain uninvolved and, one senses, uninformed. On the premise that it is desirable that parents be involved with the schools their children attend, it is unfortunate that even a program such as the I/E day program has limited powers in realizing that

involvement.

Tenth, some might be of the opinion that those who are strongly in favor of teaching heritage languages and cultures in the schools would be less interested in the regular school programs. The investigators suspect that this is not the case, for discussions about the I/E day programs nearly always led to discussions about the regular programs. The desire for excellent regular programs was obvious. When asked on the questionnaire to suggest changes that should be made in the regular programs, the three most popular were: (1) more individual attention, (2) smaller classes, (3) more computers, and, on the part of the parents, (4) more homework.

George Bernard Shaw, in The Devil's Disciple, wrote:

The worst sin towards our fellow creatures
is not to hate them, but to be indifferent
to them; that's the essence of inhumanity.

The investigators can state without reservation that the adults involved with the I/E day programs are not indifferent. What mostly exists instead is passion, caring, hard work and sensible attitudes. The children in these schools are, in this regard, very fortunate. While it is true that antagonisms do exist, the investigators were impressed by the frequency with which individuals, even the most outspoken leaders of the various groups, expressed regret that they had been allowed to develop and privately longed for solutions.

APPENDIX A
TABLES A1 - A9

Table A1

THE CULTURAL/ETHNIC GROUPS TO WHICH
TEACHERS BELONG

Cultural/Ethnic Group	Teachers (N = 130)
	%
Canadian	36
Italian	5
Ukrainian	4
Middle European/European	4
French	3
Polish	3
British	3
Czeckoslovakian	3
Chinese	3
Yugoslavian/Croatian	2
Lithuanian	1
French Canadian	1
Greek	1
English	1
West Indian	1
Irish	1
Japanese	1
Swedish	1
Australian	1
Austrian	1
Macedonian	1
No response	23

Table A2

QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCES OF INSTRUCTORS*

Qualifications and Experiences	Lead Instructors (N = 6)	HL Instructors (N = 11)	CC Instructors (N = 22)
	%	%	%
Canadian teaching certificate	50	18	18
Teaching certificate from outside Canada	33	73	9
B.A.	67	46	50
M.A.	-	18	9
Ph.D.	-	-	-
Diploma in Early Childhood Education	17	9	5
Fluent in English	100	91	96
Fluent in French	-	18	9
Canadian teaching experience	67	55	73
Educational assistant in Toronto Board	33	-	14
Teaching experience outside Canada	50	73	9

*No BC instructors returned a questionnaire.

Table A3

SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS OF THE PARENTS*

Status	All Parents (N = 449)	HL/BC Parents (N = 239)	OC Parents (N = 103)	HL & OC Parents (N = 65)	UI Parents (N = 42)
	%	%	%	%	%
Low SES	47	48	42	55	48
Medium SES	12	11	18	9	4
High SES	15	16	18	9	10
Other (unemployed, homemaker, student, pensioner, retired)	4	3	3	9	-
No response	22	22	18	17	38

- 64 -

*A chi square test on the frequencies represented by the percentages in the last four columns of this table was significant at the .05 level with 12 degrees of freedom. Therefore, the socio-economic status of the four groups is different.

Table A4
THE CULTURAL OR ETHNIC GROUPS TO WHICH THE CHILDREN BELONG*

Cultural or Ethnic Groups	All Parents (N = 449)	HL/BC Parents (N = 239)	CC Parents (N = 103)	HL & CC Parents (N = 65)	UI Parents (N = 42)
	%	%	%	%	%
Chinese	29	31	11	63	14
Canadian	28	23	50	11	21
Portuguese	8	12	4	3	5
Italian	6	6	7	5	5
Vietnamese	3	4	2	2	5
Greek	3	3	2	6	5
Spanish	3	3	3	3	2
West Indian	3	3	3	2	-
East Indian/Pakistani	2	4	1	-	5
English/British/WASP	2	4 ₂	5	-	2
French	1	4 ₂	-	2	5
American	1	1	1	-	-
Ukrainian	4 ₂	-	2	-	-
Irish	4 ₂	-	2	-	-
Japanese	4 ₂	4 ₂	1	-	-
Filipino	4 ₂	4 ₂	-	2	-
Yugoslavian	4 ₂	-	-	3	-
Scottish	4 ₂	-	2	-	-
Black	4 ₂	4 ₂	-	-	-
Australian	4 ₂	4 ₂	-	-	-
Arabic	4 ₂	-	1	-	-
Laotian	4 ₂	-	1	-	-
Korean	4 ₂	-	1	-	-
Russian	4 ₂	-	-	-	-
Hungarian	4 ₂	-	-	2	-
No response	17	15	16	5	45

*These columns do not add to 100% since 45 parents described their children as belonging to two or more groups.

Table A5

THE LANGUAGES THE CHILDREN LEARNED TO SPEAK FIRST*

Languages	All Parents (N = 449)	HL/BC Parents (N = 239)	CC Parents (N = 103)	HL & CC Parents (N = 65)	UI Parents (N = 42)
	%	%	%	%	%
English	38	32	60	26	33
Chinese	31	31	14	66	19
Portuguese	10	16	6	2	5
Greek	5	5	4	6	4
Italian	5	6	4	5	2
Vietnamese	4	5	4	2	5
Spanish	3	3	4	2	2
Hindi	2	2	1	-	5
French	1	1	-	2	5
Urdu	1	$\frac{1}{2}$	-	2	2
Panjabi	1	$\frac{1}{2}$	-	-	5
Ukrainian	1	$\frac{1}{2}$	2	-	-
Serbian	$\frac{1}{2}$	-	-	3	-
Arabic	$\frac{1}{2}$	-	1	-	-
Gujarati	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	-	-	-
Laotian	$\frac{1}{2}$	-	1	-	-
Finnish	$\frac{1}{2}$	-	1	-	-
Pilipino	$\frac{1}{2}$	-	-	2	-
Dutch	$\frac{1}{2}$	-	1	-	-
Slavic	$\frac{1}{2}$	-	1	-	-
Ojibwa	$\frac{1}{2}$	-	1	-	-
No response	7	6	5	2	26

*These columns do not add to 100% since 48 parents reported that their children learned two or more languages simultaneously.

Table A6

THE CULTURAL OR ETHNIC GROUPS TO WHICH THE CHILDREN BELONG IN THE HL/BC GROUP OF RESPONDENTS BY HL CLASS*

Cultural or Ethnic Groups	Chinese Class (N = 90) %**	Portuguese Class (N = 49) %	Italian Class (N = 29) %	Greek Class (N = 15) %	Spanish Class (N = 14) %	Vietnamese Class (N = 7) %	Black Cul-tural Class (N = 5) %	Hindi Class (N = 5) %	Panjabi Class (N = 3) %	Urdu Class (N = 1) %
Chinese	72	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Portuguese	-	49	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Italian	-	6	41	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Greek	-	-	-	40	-	-	-	-	-	-
Spanish	1	-	-	-	50	-	-	-	-	-
Vietnamese	1	-	-	-	-	100	-	-	-	-
West Indian	-	4	3	-	14	-	80	-	-	-
Hindi	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	20	-	-
Panjabi	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	33	-
Urdu	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
East Indian	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	60	-	-
Pakistani	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Indo-Canadian	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100
Canadian	18	22	45	27	29	-	40	20	33	-
Anglo-Saxon	-	-	-	-	7	-	-	-	-	-
British	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
American	1	2	-	-	7	-	-	-	-	-
Australian	-	-	-	-	7	-	-	-	-	-
French	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Japanese	-	-	-	-	7	-	-	-	-	-
Filipino	-	-	-	-	7	-	-	-	-	-
No information	11	24	10	33	7	-	-	20	33	-

*The Arabic class was discontinued during the time the questionnaires were sent out.

**These columns do not add to 100% since some parents described their children as belonging to two or more groups.

Table A7

THE CULTURAL OR ETHNIC GROUPS TO WHICH THE CHILDREN BELONG IN THE HL & OC GROUP OF RESPONDENTS BY HL CLASS *

Cultural or Ethnic Groups	Chinese & CC Classes (N = 44)	Spanish & CC Classes (N = 5)	Italian & CC Classes (N = 4)	Greek & CC Classes (N = 3)	Portuguese & CC Classes (N = 2)	Vietnamese & CC Classes (N = 1)
	% **	%	%	%	%	%
Chinese	90	-	-	-	-	-
Spanish	-	40	25	-	-	-
Italian	-	-	25	-	50	-
Greek	-	-	-	67	-	-
Portuguese	-	-	25	-	100	-
Vietnamese	-	-	-	-	-	100
Canadian	7	20	-	-	-	-
Yugoslavian	-	40	-	-	-	-
Hungarian	-	20	25	-	-	-
Italian Canadian	-	-	50	-	-	-
West Indian	2	-	-	-	-	-
Greek Canadian	-	-	-	33	-	-
No information	4	-	-	-	-	-

*The Arabic class was discontinued during the time the questionnaires were sent out.

**These columns do not add to 100% since some parents described their children as belonging to the two or more groups.

Table A8

FIRST LANGUAGES OF CHILDREN IN THE HL/BC GROUP OF RESPONDENTS*

Languages Children Learned to Speak First	Chinese Class (N = 90) %**	Portuguese Class (N = 49) %	Italian Class (N = 29) %	Greek Class (N = 15) %	Spanish Class (N = 14) %	Vietnamese Class (N = 7) %	Black Cul- tural Class (N = 5) %	Hindi Class (N = 5) %	Panjabi Class (N = 3) %	Urdu Class (N = 1) %
Chinese	74	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Portuguese	-	65	7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Italian	-	6	38	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Greek	-	-	-	80	-	-	-	-	-	-
Spanish	1	-	-	-	36	-	-	-	-	-
Vietnamese	3	-	-	-	-	100	-	-	-	-
English	23	20	48	40	79	-	80	60	67	-
Hindi	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	80	-	-
Panjabi	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	33	-
Urdu	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100
French	-	2	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gujarati	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ukrainian	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
No response	7	10	-	-	-	-	20	-	-	-

*The Arabic class was discontinued during the time the questionnaires were sent out.

**These columns do not add to 100% since some parents reported that their children learned two or more languages simultaneously.

Table A9

FIRST LANGUAGES OF CHILDREN IN THE HL & OC GROUP OF RESPONDENTS*

Languages Children Learned to Speak First	Chinese & OC Classes (N = 44)	Spanish & OC Classes (N = 5)	Italian & OC Classes (N = 4)	Greek & OC Classes (N = 3)	Portuguese & OC Classes (N = 2)	Vietnamese & OC Classes (N = 1)
	% **	%	%	%	%	%
Chinese	95	-	-	-	-	-
Spanish	-	20	-	-	-	-
Italian	-	-	50	-	50	-
Greek	2	-	-	67	-	-
Portuguese	-	-	-	-	50	-
Vietnamese	-	-	-	-	-	100
English	18	40	75	33	50	-
Serbian	-	40	-	-	-	-
French	-	-	-	-	50	-

*The Arabic class was discontinued during the time the questionnaires were sent out.

**These columns do not add to 100% since some parents reported that their children learned two or more languages simultaneously.

APPENDIX B
TABLES B1 - B51

Table B1

SHOULD CHILDREN LEARN THEIR HERITAGE LANGUAGES?

Respondents	Yes	No	Don't Know	No Response	Number of Respondents
	%	%	%	%	
Principals/Vice-Principals	94	6	-	-	16
Teachers	85	2	1	12	130
Administrative Assistants	90	-	-	10	10
Lead Instructors	100	-	-	-	6
HL Instructors	91	-	-	9	11
CC Instructors	77	9	-	14	22
HL/BC Parents	90	2	1	7	239
CC Parents	85	5	3	7	103
HL & CC Parents	95	-	-	5	65
UI Parents	86	5	2	7	42

Table B2

REASONS CHILDREN SHOULD LEARN THEIR HERITAGE LANGUAGES

Reasons	Principals/Vice-Principals (N = 16)	Teachers (N = 130)	Administrative Assistants (N = 10)	Lead Instructors (N = 6)	HL Instructors (N = 11)	CC Instructors (N = 22)	HL/BC Parents (N = 239)	CC Parents (N = 103)	HL & CC Parents (N = 65)	UI Parents (N = 42)
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Facilitates learning English	25	19	10	67	36	18	26	22	35	14
Facilitates learning all languages	44	31	30	83	18	36	40	27	43	24
Motivates study of more languages	6	27	30	67	73	46	60	37	60	38
Improves other academic learning	13	12	20	50	46	23	36	21	37	14
Improves thinking abilities	31	27	20	67	91	41	49	32	57	21
Makes children better educated	25	32	30	33	82	32	52	42	69	33
Improves communication with relatives	88	72	60	83	91	77	77	65	79	62
Improves communication in community	38	45	60	83	82	36	69	39	63	57
Improves communication in schoolyard	13	10	10	17	27	18	32	18	39	12
Facilitates world travel and mobility	38	37	40	50	73	23	57	49	62	55
May be studied in higher education	38	45	40	17	55	36	46	41	43	38
Improves future employability	25	39	50	67	82	46	64	43	63	45
Maintains/Revitalizes culture and religion	50	62	70	100	73	46	59	53	69	33
Provides a chance to excel	6	19	20	-	36	9	34	19	48	12
Enhances self-confidence	50	41	60	50	73	23	47	38	54	29
Enhances pride in heritage	88	65	70	67	100	77	65	64	80	60
Increases social acceptance	6	19	10	33	73	18	41	17	52	24
Canada is multicultural	19	33	20	83	82	27	66	44	74	50
Languages are best learned when young	44	54	60	100	82	50	76	65	83	64

Table B3

BY WHAT METHOD SHOULD CHILDREN LEARN THEIR HERITAGE LANGUAGES IN TORONTO?

Methods *	Principals/ Vice- Principals (N = 16)	Teachers (N = 130)	Adminis- trative Assistants (N = 10)	Lead Instructors (N = 11)	HL Instructors (N = 11)	CC Instructors (N = 22)	HL/BC Parents (N = 239)	CC Parents (N = 103)	HL & CC Parents (N = 65)	UI Parents (N = 42)
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
As a subject in an integrated/ extended school day	13	10	10	50	82	32	67	37	71	45
As a language to teach <u>some</u> other school subjects	6	3	-	33	9	5	6	7	12	10
As a language to teach <u>all</u> other school subjects	-	1	-	-	9	5	5	3	8	2
Saturday morning classes	25	42	40	-	9	18	10	26	14	14
After school classes	31	45	40	33	9	23	13	29	15	24
Summer classes	6	19	20	-	9	9	12	13	9	14
Privately funded school/classes	25	27	40	-	-	23	4	11	3	2
At home	19	27	40	-	-	18	8	19	8	10

*One principal, three teachers and one HL/BC parent indicated that children should learn their heritage languages as a subject in a regular day.

Table B4

THE BEST ORGANIZATION FOR HERITAGE LANGUAGE, BLACK CULTURAL
AND CONCURRENT PROGRAMS IN INTEGRATED/EXTENDED DAY SCHOOLS

A. Total Time Per Week										
	Vice- Principals/ Principals (N = 16)	Teachers (N = 130)	Administrative Assistants (N = 10)	Lead Instructors (N = 6)	HL Instructors (N = 11)	CC Instructors (N = 22)	HL/BC Parents (N = 239)	CC Parents (N = 103)	HL & CC Parents (N = 65)	UI Parents (N = 42)
150 minutes (2½ hours)	69	41	30	83	55	59	52	42	46	33
Less than 150 minutes	6	18	40	-	-	23	8	22	12	21
More than 150 minutes	6	6	10	17	45	9	21	13	22	14
Don't know/doesn't matter/no response	19	35	20	-	-	9	19	23	20	31

B. Number of Periods Per Week										
	Vice- Principals/ Principals (N = 16)	Teachers (N = 130)	Administrative Assistants (N = 10)	Lead Instructors (N = 6)	HL Instructors (N = 11)	CC Instructors (N = 22)	HL/BC Parents (N = 239)	CC Parents (N = 103)	HL & CC Parents (N = 65)	UI Parents (N = 42)
1 period	-	7	10	-	-	9	5	13	2	5
2 periods	19	9	20	17	27	18	11	12	9	24
3 periods	19	25	10	33	27	41	14	20	25	21
4 periods	13	3	-	-	-	5	7	6	6	2
5 periods	25	15	10	50	18	5	30	17	31	10
Don't know/doesn't matter/no response	24	41	50	-	28	22	34	33	28	38

Table B4 (cont'd.)

THE BEST ORGANIZATION FOR HERITAGE LANGUAGE, BLACK CULTURAL
AND CONCURRENT PROGRAMS IN INTEGRATED/EXTENDED DAY SCHOOLS

C. The Time of Day	Principals/ Vice- Principals (N = 16)		Teachers (N = 130)		Administrative Assistants (N = 10)		Lead Instructors (N = 6)		HL Instructors (N = 11)		CC Instructors (N = 22)		HL/BC Parents (N = 239)		CC Parents (N = 103)		HL & CC Parents (N = 65)		UI Parents (N = 42)	
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Early morning	-	3	10	-	-	9	14	17	15	12										
Late morning	6	2	10	-	-	18	5	4	5	19										
Early afternoon	-	3	10	17	9	14	23	20	26	10										
Late afternoon	44	52	40	33	18	27	21	31	28	19										
Don't know/doesn't matter/no response	50	40	30	50	46	32	37	28	26	41										

D. Instructors' Timetables	All HL/BC/CC classes at the same time		HL/BC/CC classes at various times of the day		Don't know/doesn't matter/no response	
	%	%	%	%	%	%
	63	65	70	100	36	29
	25	8	10	-	55	26
	12	27	20	-	9	45

Table B4 (cont'd.)

THE BEST ORGANIZATION FOR HERITAGE LANGUAGE, BLACK CULTURAL
AND CONCURRENT PROGRAMS IN INTEGRATED/EXTENDED DAY SCHOOLS

E. Class Size	Principals/ Vice- Principals (N = 16)		Teachers (N = 130)		Administrative Assistants (N = 10)		Lead Instructors (N = 6)		HL Instructors (N = 11)		CC Instructors (N = 22)		HL/BC Parents (N = 239)		CC Parents (N = 103)		HL & CC Parents (N = 65)		UI Parents (N = 42)	
	%		%		%		%		%		%		%		%		%		%	
20	19		30		10		33		46		27		30		27		40		24	
Less than 20	44		27		70		67		54		64		43		48		25		38	
More than 20	19		11		10		-		-		-		2		4		5		2	
Any size	6		8		10		-		-		-		12		6		17		17	
Don't know/doesn't matter/no response	12		24		-		-		-		9		13		16		14		19	

F. Number of Languages Per School	Principals/ Vice- Principals (N = 16)		Teachers (N = 130)		Administrative Assistants (N = 10)		Lead Instructors (N = 6)		HL Instructors (N = 11)		CC Instructors (N = 22)		HL/BC Parents (N = 239)		CC Parents (N = 103)		HL & CC Parents (N = 65)		UI Parents (N = 42)	
	%		%		%		%		%		%		%		%		%		%	
1	13		9		20		-		-		5		2		5		-		-	
2	6		7		-		-		-		18		6		16		6		14	
3	19		5		20		17		9		18		20		10		14		10	
4	13		1		-		17		-		5		3		6		5		10	
5	-		2		10		-		18		5		2		1		8		2	
6	-		-		-		-		-		-		-		2		-		-	
7	-		-		-		-		-		-		1/2		-		-		-	
8	6		-		-		-		-		-		1/2		-		1		-	
9	-		-		-		-		-		-		1		2		-		-	
Any number	25		37		40		66		64		18		30		28		25		29	
Don't know/no response	18		39		10		-		9		31		36		31		42		36	

Table B5

OPINIONS ABOUT THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE INTEGRATED/EXTENDED SCHOOL DAY

Opinions	Principals/ Vice- Principals (N = 16)	Teachers (N = 130)	Administrative Assistants (n = 10)	Lead Instructors (N = 6)	HL Instructors (N = 11)	CC Instructors (N = 22)	HL/BC Parents (N = 239)	CC Parents (N = 103)	HL & CC Parents (N = 65)	UI Parents (N = 42)
Democratic	25	18	10	50	82	32	54	26	69	41
Good resource people	38	23	20	67	82	55	57	38	68	55
Good information	38	18	40	50	91	27	62	43	71	55
Good parent representation	63	28	10	50	82	36	56	37	63	45
Good teacher representation	50	22	20	50	73	41	58	42	71	60
Good principal representation	63	34	60	83	82	64	57	44	68	55
Good instructor representation	31	*	20	67	82	64	59	42	69	50
Good administrative assistant representation	25	22	60	50	46	55	*	*	49	*
Trustees attend to all groups	25	16	10	*	55	*	*	*	55	*
Board administrators attend to all groups	44	22	*	33	46	*	*	*	57	*
It is a power struggle among many groups	88	68	80	50	46	41	*	*	46	43
The best interests of the children are considered	6	10	20	50	91	41	66	43	66	57
Promises fulfilled	-	14	10	*	73	*	41	*	43	43
Good use of taxpayers' money	6	12	-	33	100	36	49	38	63	57
Individual school voting is best	69	60	50	67	64	*	50	49	43	38
More than 50% vote should be required	94	75	60	83	73	64	47	48	37	38
50% enrolment in HL/BC should be required	94	69	70	67	55	46	36	44	29	*
Switching between HL, BC and CC should be allowed	69	32	70	*	55	32	43	46	54	43

*50% or more of the respondents said "Don't Know" and/or did not respond.

Table B6

DOES THE I/E DAY AFFECT CHILDREN DIFFERENTLY
FROM THE REGULAR DAY?

Respondents	Yes	No	Don't Know	No Response	Number of Respondents
	%	%	%	%	
Principals/Vice-principals	100	-	-	-	16
Teachers	88	2	6	4	130
HL/BC Parents	41	38	11	11	239
CC Parents	52	31	11	7	103
HL & CC Parents	43	43	5	9	65
UI Parents	24	31	24	21	42

Table B7

WAYS IN WHICH THE I/E DAY AFFECT CHILDREN DIFFERENTLY FROM THE REGULAR DAY

Effects	Principals/ Vice- Principals (N = 16)	Teachers (N = 130)	HL/BC Parents (N = 239)	CC Parents (N = 103)	HL & CC Parents (N = 65)	UI Parents (N = 42)
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Fatigue and stress (more)	75	80	20	35	15	24
Problems going home (more)	50	49	12	25	11	17
Remedial work (less)	63	37	12	5	11	7
Extra curricular activities (less)	94	61	17	18	14	19
School spirit (worse)	69	49	9	21	2	7
Happiness in school (less)	38	46	8	22	3	7
Respect and understanding for each other (less)	31	41	3	16	-	7
Academic achievement (worse)	25	40	5	14	-	7
Multicultural friendships (more)	13	15	36	24	37	26
Relationships with adults in school (better)	13	8	24	19	29	19
Amount of work (too much)	69	44	13	15	9	19
Amount of play (too little)	50	45	12	16	6	14
Understanding of school schedules (worse)	38	39	5	12	-	10
Time spent in library (less)	43	55	13	17	6	10
Punctuality (worse)	44	36	4	11	-	10
Attendance (worse)	25	23	3	10	-	2
Chances to excel (more)	-	15	23	17	35	17
Self-confidence (more)	13	14	30	24	39	21
Integration of Special Education students (less)	50	25	•	•	•	•
Chances for Special Education students to excel (less)	25	29	•	•	•	•
Home-school conflict (more)	31	32	13	16	11	10

Table B7 (cont'd.)

WAYS IN WHICH THE I/E DAY AFFECT CHILDREN DIFFERENTLY FROM THE REGULAR DAY

Effects	Principals/ Vice- Principals (N = 16)	Teachers (N = 130)	HL/BC Parents (N = 239)	CC Parents (N = 103)	HL & CC Parents (N = 65)	UI Parents (N = 42)
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Identity problems (more)	13	19	11	14	15	5
Communication in school yard (worse)	19	25	•	•	•	•
Pride in heritage (more)	31	26	34	•	43	5
Motivation to learn HL/BC (for young children) (more)	38	19	24	•	37	7
Motivation to learn HL/BC (for older children) (less)	56	29	20	•	6	•
Academic motivation (more)	6	6	28	18	31	14
Ability to think (better)	6	9	30	18	39	21
Get languages and cultures mixed up (more)	19	30	8	•	9	7
Remember regular homework (less)	44	41	6	15	3	7
Adjustment to school (worse)	19	33	6	8	2	12
Some feel alienated (more)	19	30	8	18	6	14
Think HL's and BC's are important (more)	6	10	23	•	34	5
Chances to learn languages other than HL's (more)	13	18	29	15	37	24
Enrichment (less)	44	34	3	11	•	5
Disruptions of out-of-school activities (e.g. music lessons) (more)	•	•	11	28	6	10

*This item was not asked of these respondents.

Table B8

DOES THE I/E DAY AFFECT THE COMMUNITY AND
PARENTS DIFFERENTLY FROM THE REGULAR DAY?

Respondents	Yes	No	Don't Know	No Response	Number of Respondents
	%	%	%	%	
Principals/Vice-principals	88	-	6	6	16
Teachers	55	4	34	7	130
Administrative Assistants	80	10	10	-	10
HL/BC Parents	33	42	14	11	239
CC Parents	44	36	16	4	103
HL & CC Parents	43	37	8	12	65
UI Parents	24	38	19	19	42

Table B9

WAYS IN WHICH THE I/E DAY AFFECT THE COMMUNITY AND PARENTS DIFFERENTLY FROM THE REGULAR DAY

Effects	Principals/ Vice- Principals (N = 16)	Teachers (N = 130)	Administra- tive Assistants (N = 10)	HL/BC Parents (N = 239)	CC Parents (N = 103)	HL & CC Parents (N = 65)	UI Parents (N = 42)
Respect and understanding among parents (less)	38	22	60	1	16	3	5
Cooperation among parents (less)	50	29	50	3	17	2	7
Parent involvement in school (more positive)	31	12	20	33	24	46	17
Understanding between regular teachers and parents (worse)	25	27	50	2	16	-	5
Parent responsibilities for success of school programs (less)	19	24	30	2	15	3	5
Parent self-confidence (better)	25	13	20	21	14	34	14
Parents' understanding of their roles with respect to school (better)	6	9	20	25	19	39	24
Appeal of school for other families (worse)	13	15	40	3	13	2	2
Jobs in schools for adults (more)	63	35	70	19	18	28	17
Disruptions to family life (less)	•	•	•	8	5	25	10
Babysitting costs (more)	•	•	•	10	20	5	17
Concern for safety of children (more)	•	•	•	18	23	19	26
Travel time to school (more)	•	•	•	13	18	14	19

*This item was not asked of these respondents.

Table B10

DOES THE I/E DAY AFFECT THE REGULAR STAFF
DIFFERENTLY FROM THE REGULAR DAY?

Respondents	Yes	No	Don't Know	No Response	Number of Respondents
	%	%	%	%	
Principals/Vice- Principals	100	-	-	-	16
Teachers	93	1	4	2	130
Administrative Assistants	100	-	-	-	10

Table B11

WAYS IN WHICH THE I/E DAY AFFECT THE REGULAR STAFF
DIFFERENTLY FROM THE REGULAR DAY

Effects	Principals/ Vice- Principals (N = 16)	Teachers (N = 130)	Adminis- trative Assistants (N = 10)
	%	%	%
Supervision duties of principals/vice-principals (more)	100	77	100
Supervision duties of teachers (more)	56	59	50
Supervision duties of administrative assistants (more)	75	54	100
Fatigue/stress of principals/vice-principals (more)	100	78	90
Fatigue/stress of teachers (more)	81	87	80
Fatigue/stress of administrative assistants (more)	88	69	90
Absenteeism of principals/vice-principals	*	*	*
Absenteeism of teachers	*	*	*
Absenteeism of administrative assistants	*	*	*
Principal/vice-principal workload (more)	100	82	90
Teacher workload (more)	63	61	50
Administrative assistant workload (more)	88	62	90
Caretaker workload (more)	81	72	80
Teaching time of ESL teachers	*	*	*
Teaching time of Special Education teachers (less)	*	*	50
Access to principals (less)	94	55	70
Performance of regular duties (e.g. CIP) (harder)	88	50	60
In-school preparation time (worse)	44	35	50
Cohesiveness among staff (less)	50	*	60
Pressures from unions (more)	88	*	*
Relationships with SCR personnel (worse)	*	*	40
Inner conflicts (more)	50	*	70
Morale (lower)	88	71	90
Sense of security (less)	50	*	60
Professionalism (decreased)	56	*	*

Table B11 (cont'd.)

WAYS IN WHICH THE I/E DAY AFFECT THE REGULAR STAFF
DIFFERENTLY FROM THE REGULAR DAY

	Principals/ Vice- Principals (N = 16)	Teachers (N = 130)	Adminis- trative Assistants (N = 10)
	%	%	%
Status of teaching profession (weaker)	50	52	50
Support of Board policies (less)	50	49	*
Publicity	*	*	*
Transfer and adjustment of principals/vice- principals	*	*	*

*50% or more of the respondents did not check the item therefore indicating they felt there was no effect either way.

Table B12

DOES THE I/E DAY AFFECT THE SCHOOL DIFFERENTLY
FROM THE REGULAR DAY?

Respondents	Yes	No	Don't Know	No Response	Number of Respondents
	%	%	%	%	
Principals/ Vice-Principals	81	6	-	13	16
Teachers	88	1	4	7	130
Administrative Assistants	80	-	-	20	10

Table B13

WAYS IN WHICH THE I/E DAY AFFECT THE SCHOOL DIFFERENTLY
FROM THE REGULAR DAY

Effects	Principals/ Vice Principals (N = 16)	Teachers (N = 130)	Adminis- trative Assistants (N = 10)
	%	%	%
Interschool activities (fewer)	94	75	80
Use of sports facilities (less)	81	69	70
Vandalism (more)	*	*	50
Parent support (less)	*	*	40
Interruptions to teaching time (more)	81	77	90
Disorientation (more)	*	57	90
Overall school discipline (worse)	*	66	60
Use of resources such as computers	*	*	*
Access to other TBE departments, meetings and activities	*	*	*
Access to parks and recreation facilities	*	*	*
Scheduling Special Education (harder)	69	*	60
Scheduling Kindergarten (harder)	63	*	*
Scheduling French (harder)	75	*	60
Scheduling ESL (harder)	81	*	60
Scheduling regular classes (harder)	88	59	70
Scheduling for buses (harder)	56	*	*
Scheduling in K-6 schools (harder)	75	54	50
Scheduling in K-8 schools (harder)	63	*	*
Scheduling noon hour activities (harder)	63	51	*
Scheduling for discipline time (harder)	56	68	60
Teaching classes as a whole (withdrawals) (harder)	63	59	60
Planning regular classes (harder)	75	65	90

*50% or more of the respondents did not check the item therefore indicating they felt there was no effect either way.

Table B14

**WORKING AND SOCIAL ACCOMMODATIONS BETWEEN THE TEACHERS AND INSTRUCTORS
IN THE I/E DAY SCHOOLS**

Accommodations	Principals/ Vice Principals (N = 16)		Teachers (N = 130)		Lead Instructors (N = 6)		HL Instructors (N = 11)		OC Instructors (N = 22)	
	%		%		%		%		%	
In communicating about children (poor)	56		52		33		18		41	
In communicating about course content (poor)	56		62		67		46		59	
In communicating about student evaluation (poor)	56		56		50		36		55	
In communicating about school activities (poor)	44		52		67		18		46	
In rewarding children (poor)	31		31		50		27		27	
In disciplining children (poor)	31		55		50		18		46	
In supervising children (poor)	56		56		33		18		36	
In organizing concerts and festivals (good)	56		25		67		64		27	
In getting access to preparation space (poor)	56		42		17		27		23	
In using school space (general) (good)	56		32		67		64		68	
In using classroom space (good)	56		28		50		64		64	
In using staff room space (good)	56		40		83		73		82	
In using office space (good)	69		24		67		73		77	
In using blackboard space (poor)	19		24		50		18		18	
In using wall space (poor)	19		23		50		55		14	
In using cupboard space (good)	44		25		50		55		55	
In using bulletin boards (good)	56		30		67		46		50	
In using flip charts (good)	25		*		17		46		41	

Table B14 (cont'd.)
WORKING AND SOCIAL ACCOMMODATIONS BETWEEN THE TEACHERS AND INSTRUCTORS
IN THE I/E DAY SCHOOLS

Accommodations	Principals/ Vice					Lead		HL		CC	
	Principals (N = 16)	Teachers (N = 130)	Instructors (N = 6)	Instructors (N = 11)	Instructors (N = 22)	%	%	%	%	%	%
In using tape recorders (good)	44	21	50	46	73						
In using projectors (good)	63	19	50	46	59						
In using office equipment (good)	69	*	67	64	64						
In using classroom furniture (good)	63	28	50	82	64						
In maintenance and housekeeping duties (good)	25	21	33	73	50						
In using school supplies (good)	50	20	50	82	55						
In meeting together formally (poor)	50	50	67	82	41						

*50% or more of the respondents said "Don't Know" and/or did not respond.

Table B15

**HOW SHOULD PRINCIPALS AND VICE-PRINCIPALS REACT
TO THE I/E DAY?**

Reactions	Principals/ Vice-Principals (N = 16)
	%
Encourage children to study HL's and BC	69
Encourage instructors to integrate	81
Be willing to learn about other cultures	88
Encourage parents to enrol children in HL's and BC	50
Trust other groups	63
Treat all children the same	69
Be willing to work on solving problems	88
Be receptive to the changes	81
Be willing to help instructors	88
Put children before Federation matters*	44

*38% did not respond to this item.

Table B16

HOW DO PRINCIPALS AND VICE-PRINCIPALS REACT TO THE I/E DAY?

Reactions	Teachers (N = 130)	Adminis- trative Assistants (N = 10)	Lead Instructors (N = 6)	HL Instructors (N = 11)	OC Instructors (N = 22)	HL/BC Parents (N = 239)	OC Parents (N = 103)	HL&OC Parents (N = 65)	UI Parents (N = 42)
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Encourage children to study HL's and BC	31	60	67	82	50	42	38	57	31
Encourage instructors to integrate	30	60	50	64	50	36	32	57	38
Willing to learn about other cultures	42	60	83	73	46	40	40	55	38
Encourage parents to enrol children in HL's and BC	29	60	67	73	50	47	43	60	33
Trust other groups	27	30	50	64	55	30	27	40	26
Treat all children the same	42	70	83	64	64	57	48	63	52
Willing to work on solving problems	51	70	83	91	73	54	48	65	41
Receptive to the changes	39	60	83	82	64	37	38	46	33
Willing to help instructors	48	70	83	91	77	45	39	57	38
Put children before Federation matters	35	30	67	46	36	34	30	57	29

Table B17

HOW SHOULD TEACHERS REACT TO THE I/E DAY?

Reactions	Teachers (N = 130)
	%
Encourage children to study HL's and BC	49
Encourage instructors to integrate	48
Be willing to learn about other cultures	75
Encourage parents to enrol children in HL's and BC	31
Trust other groups	45
Treat all children the same	76
Be willing to work on solving problems	72
Be receptive to the changes	56
Be willing to help instructors	53
Put children before Federation matters*	57

*23% did not respond to this item. A few made a note that they resented it.

Table B18

HOW DO TEACHERS REACT TO THE I/E DAY?

Reactions	Principals/ Vice Principals (N = 16)	Administrative Assistants (N = 10)	Lead Instructors (N = 6)	HL Instructors (N = 11)	CC Instructors (N = 22)	HL/BC Parents (N = 239)	CC Parents (N = 103)	HL & BC Parents (N = 65)	UI Parents (N = 42)
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Encourage children to study HL's and BC	31	40	33	27	32	44	35	59	31
Encourage instructors to integrate	25	30	33	36	27	34	24	52	36
Willing to learn about other cultures	56	40	50	36	46	39	41	54	33
Encourage parents to enrol children in HL's and BC	13	40	17	27	32	45	32	57	33
Trust other groups	13	30	17	27	32	33	21	40	24
Treat all children the same	69	70	67	64	41	54	47	66	43
Willing to work on solving problems	63	60	50	73	50	47	49	62	36
Receptive to the changes	38	30	33	36	36	34	30	45	31
Willing to help instructors	56	30	50	55	59	38	35	51	31
Put children before Federation matters	13	60	33	9	32	34	31	54	31

Table B19

OPINIONS ABOUT THE HL AND BC INSTRUCTORS

Opinions	Principals/ Vice- Principals (N = 16)	Teachers (N = 130)	Lead Instructors (N = 6)	HL Instructors** (N = 11)	HL Parents (N = 234)	BC Parents (N = 5)	HL & CC Parents (N = 65)	UI Parents (N = 42)
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Good role models for the children	63	*	67	91	56	60	59	*
Good resource personnel for regular staff	50	24	83	91	*	60	*	*
Communicate well with parents about children	56	*	67	91	50	80	57	*
Cooperate well with parents	81	*	67	*	51	80	51	*
Understand and know the children	50	*	50	100	52	80	52	*
Are committed and enthusiastic	81	*	83	91	*	60	52	*
Experience pressure to motivate children	56	*	67	91	*	*	*	*
Experience pressure to prove themselves	44	*	67	82	*	*	*	*
Must try to please too many groups	25	*	83	46	*	*	*	*
Turnover rate is too high	38	*	67	*	*	*	*	*
Disillusioned with job	*	*	*	46	*	*	*	*
Feel like second class citizens	*	*	*	27	*	*	*	*
Have many other jobs	*	*	*	36	*	*	*	*
Need time to adjust to the Toronto Board	*	*	*	67	*	*	*	*
Willing to do volunteer work with children	*	*	*	73	*	*	*	*

*50% or more of the respondents said "Don't Know" and/or gave no response.

**BC instructors are not included as they did not answer the questionnaire.

*This item was not asked of these respondents.

Table B20

OPINIONS ABOUT THE CC INSTRUCTORS

Opinions	Principals/ Vice Principals (N = 16)	Teachers (N = 130)	Lead Instructors (N = 6)	CC Instructors (N = 22)	CC Parents (N = 103)	HL & CC Parents (N = 65)	UI Parents (N = 42)
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Good role models for the children	63	*	50	73	*	*	*
Good resource personnel for regular school staff	38	*	67	73	*	*	*
Communicate well with parents about children	44	*	50	32	35	48	*
Cooperate well with parents	63	*	50	*	36	*	*
Understand and know the children	50	*	*	68	39	*	*
Are committed and enthusiastic	88	*	67	77	*	52	*
Experience pressure to motivate children	44	*	50	50	*	*	*
Experience pressure to prove themselves	44	*	50	36	*	*	*
Must try to please too many groups	25	*	83	23	*	*	*
Turnover rate is too high	56	*	67	*	*	*	*
Disillusioned with job	*	*	*	18	*	*	*
Feel like second class citizens	*	*	*	23	*	*	*
Have many other jobs	*	*	*	41	*	*	*
Need time to adjust to the Toronto Board	*	*	*	23	*	*	*
Willing to do volunteer work with children	*	*	*	46	*	*	*

*50% or more of the respondents said "Don't know" and/or gave no response.

*This item was not asked of these respondents.

Table B21

**DO RESPONDENTS FEEL WELL INFORMED ABOUT THE
HERITAGE LANGUAGE AND CONCURRENT PROGRAMS IN THE
INTEGRATED/EXTENDED DAY SCHOOLS?**

Respondents	Yes	No	Don't Know	No Response	Number No Respondents
	%	%	%	%	
Principals/Vice- Principals	88	-	-	12	16
Teachers	36	46	10	8	130
Administrative Assistants	50	50	-	-	10
Lead Instructors	83	17	-	-	6
HL Instructors	73	18	-	9	11
CC Instructors	36	46	-	18	22
HL/BC Parents	44	28	16	12	239
CC Parents	32	49	12	7	103
HL & CC Parents	57	15	17	11	65
UI Parents	26	38	17	19	42

Table B22

SOURCES OF INFORMATION ABOUT THE HL/BC/CC PROGRAMS IN THE I/E DAY SCHOOLS

Sources	Principals/ Vice- Principals (N = 16)	Teachers (N = 130)	Administrative Assistants (N = 10)	Lead Instructors (N = 6)	HL Instructors (N = 11)	CC Instructors (N = 22)	HL/BC Parents (N = 239)	CC Parents (N = 103)	HL & CC Parents (N = 65)	UI Parents (N = 42)
Trustees	19	15	20	33	36	5	17	16	26	10
Toronto Board administrators	75	19	30	67	36	14	19	9	25	19
Principals/Vice-Principals	88	54	70	67	73	55	29	32	43	21
School Community Relations Department	19	6	50	33	9	9	20	10	20	19
Toronto Teachers' Federation	44	42	30	-	-	5	7	7	20	17
Administrative Assistants	25	12	40	50	27	14	8	5	12	7
Teachers	38	40	50	33	55	46	34	33	42	24
HL/BC/CC Instructors	56	20	40	67	73	64	31	15	40	17
Parents	44	9	-	-	46	5	20	15	22	17
Children	6	34	20	-	27	32	36	43	35	21
Newspapers	6	29	10	33	36	27	18	17	25	24
Television	6	18	-	17	9	18	13	11	25	19
Other	-	4	10	33	-	5	8	5	11	12

Table B23

TOPICS ON WHICH RESPONDENTS WOULD LIKE MORE INFORMATION ABOUT THE I/E DAY

Topics	Principals/ Vice Principals (N = 16)	Teachers (N = 130)	Adminis- trative Assistants (N = 10)	Lead In- structors (N = 6)	HL In- structors (N = 11)	QC In- structors (N = 22)	HL/BC Parents (N = 239)	CC Parents (N = 103)	HL & CC Parents (N = 65)	UI Parents (N = 42)
Goals	31	42	50	50	27	46	31	44	19	26
Disadvantages	25	37	30	50	36	18	19	30	8	14
Theory of language learning	25	29	10	67	55	18	30	29	32	21
The policy of the Toronto Board	6	23	20	50	46	41	25	36	31	29
The role of HELACON	19	33	10	67	27	36	16	25	19	19
The process of decision making	13	31	50	67	18	23	18	25	19	17
Materials used	6	22	10	50	55	36	29	34	40	19
Instructors' qualifications	19	62	50	50	27	18	39	44	35	24
Advantages	31	37	30	17	18	27	29	43	31	21
Financing/budgets	63	50	20	67	36	46	19	25	12	19
Research on bilingual education	31	29	-	67	55	23	31	25	25	17
The position of Toronto Teachers' Federation	-	22	20	50	27	23	20	23	26	7
The role of the local school liaison committees	13	22	20	50	18	5	13	17	15	10
Methods of instruction	13	51	40	67	55	46	42	52	59	41
Curriculum	31	58	50	33	18	36	33	41	46	24

Table B24

DOES CONFLICT EXIST ABOUT THE HERITAGE LANGUAGE
AND CONCURRENT PROGRAMS IN THE
INTEGRATED/EXTENDED DAY SCHOOLS?

Respondents	Yes	No	Don't Know	No Response	Number of Respondents
	%	%	%	%	
Principals/Vice-Principals	75	19	-	6	16
Teachers	72	9	13	5	130
Administrative Assistants	90	-	10	-	10
Lead Instructors	100	-	-	-	6
HL Instructors	64	27	9	-	11
CC Instructors	59	23	9	9	22
HL/BC Parents	33	28	31	8	239
CC Parents	51	21	24	4	103
HL & CC Parents	23	54	19	5	65
UI Parents	12	24	31	33	42

Table B25

RESPONDENTS' BELIEFS ABOUT THE SOURCES OF CONFLICT

Sources	Principals/ Vice- Principals (N = 16)	Teachers (N = 130)	Administrative Assistants (N = 10)	Lead Instructors (N = 6)	HL Instructors (N = 11)	CC Instructors (N = 22)	HL/BC Parents (N = 239)	CC Parents (N = 103)	HL & CC Parents (N = 65)	UI Parents (N = 42)
Trustees	75	45	70	50	9	14	13	18	2	12
Toronto Board administrators	19	40	50	33	9	5	11	15	3	14
Principals/Vice-principals	25	20	10	-	-	-	8	7	8	10
School Community Relations Department	63	26	40	-	-	5	8	11	2	10
Toronto Teachers' Federation	50	32	50	83	46	14	17	18	9	12
Administrative assistants	13	12	10	17	-	-	3	6	3	10
Teachers	44	39	50	50	27	50	21	27	15	17
HL/BC/CC instructors	19	16	-	50	27	14	7	9	2	7
Parents	44	35	50	-	9	18	11	30	5	12
Children	13	25	40	-	9	50	8	17	-	12
Newspapers	44	24	-	17	18	-	5	9	6	7
Television	13	16	-	-	-	-	3	8	8	12
Ministry of Education	44	33	10	17	-	5	7	10	2	14

Table B26

WHO SHOULD BE TRYING TO RESOLVE THE CONFLICT?

Who Should Resolve Conflict?	Principals/ Vice-Principals (N = 16)	Teachers (N = 130)	Adminis- trative Assistants (N = 10)	Lead Instructors (N = 6)	HL Instructor (N = 11)	CC Instructor (N = 22)	HL/BC Parents (N = 239)	CC Parents (N = 103)	HL & BC Parents (N = 65)	UI Parents (N = 42)
Trustees	50	50	50	67	27	23	19	28	19	21
Toronto Board administrators	56	59	70	50	55	14	25	26	14	21
Principals/Vice-principals	50	24	40	33	36	41	19	25	14	21
School Community Relations Department	13	22	30	17	27	18	13	23	8	12
Toronto Teachers' Federation	56	46	40	67	18	32	13	27	12	21
Administrative assistants	-	5	10	17	9	-	3	9	3	7
Teachers	38	30	20	33	18	32	15	29	15	17
HL/BC/CC instructors	6	14	10	-	27	27	9	14	8	12
Parents	25	24	40	17	46	32	17	29	12	14
Ministry of Education	63	46	50	50	27	36	22	32	15	24
No one	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	2	2
Conflict will decrease with time	-	2	-	17	9	5	9	10	6	7

Table B27

ARE THE RESPONSIBILITIES OF PRINCIPALS AND
VICE-PRINCIPALS DIFFERENT IN THE I/E DAY SCHOOLS?

Respondents	Yes	No	Don't Know	No Response	Number of Respondents
	%	%	%	%	
Principals/Vice- Principals	100	-	-	-	16

Table B28

THE DIFFERENT RESPONSIBILITIES OF PRINCIPALS
AND VICE-PRINCIPALS IN I/E DAY SCHOOLS

Responsibilities	Principals/ Vice-Principals (N = 16)
	%
Night meetings (more)	100
Individual parent meetings (more)	100
Individual student counselling (more)	75
Meetings with regular teachers (more)	50
Meetings with other adults (more)	88
Disciplining (more)	81
Supervision (more)	100
Class observing (more)	75
Class monitoring (more)	81
Substitution (more)	63
Interpreting Board policy (more)	81
Negotiating between groups and individuals (more)	100
Timetabling (more)	100
Interviewing and hiring (more)	100
Individual counselling on teaching methods (more)	88
Providing moral support (more)	100
Orientation of new staff (more)	81
Planning programs (more)	81
Paperwork (more)	100
Written communication (more)	94
Telephone communication (more)	100
Interaction with the media (more)	56
Interviews with visitors (more)	81
Interactions with Board administrators (more)	88
Interactions with trustees (more)	88
Interactions with SCR personnel (more)	94
Arrangement for substitutes (more)	81
Rearranging space (more)	100

Table B29

ARE THE RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE
ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANTS DIFFERENT
IN THE I/E DAY SCHOOLS?

Respondents	Yes	No	Don't Know	No Response	Number of Respondents
	%	%	%	%	
Administrative Assistants	100	-	-	-	10

Table B30

THE DIFFERENT RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE
ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANTS IN THE I/E DAY SCHOOLS

Responsibilities	Administrative Assistants (N = 10)
	%
Meetings (more)	20
Discipline (more)	70
Typing (more)	100
Duplicating (more)	100
Paper work (more)	100
Written communication (more)	80
Telephone communication (more)	90
Payrolls (more)	100
Timetables (more)	70
Registration forms (more)	80
Attendance forms (more)	60
Requisition forms (more)	90
Application forms (more)	60
Report cards (more)	70
Sign-in books (more)	70
Student cards (more)	20
Overtime duties (more)	70
Class lists (more)	70
Supplies (more)	90
Interactions with administrators (more)	70
Interactions with parents (more)	80
Interactions with trustees (more)	40
Interactions with SCR personnel (more)	60
Interactions with caretakers (more)	60
Interactions with regular staff (more)	60
Interactions with the media (more)	10
Orientation of new staff (more)	70
Adjustments to new staff (more)	80
Supervising clerical help (more)	60
Providing moral support (more)	80
Negotiating between groups (more)	60
Interruptions to regular work (more)	90
Covering for principals and vice-principals (more)	80

Table 30 (cont'd.)

THE DIFFERENT RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE
ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANTS IN THE I/E DAY SCHOOLS

Responsibilities	Administrative Assistants (N = 10)
	%
Monitoring petty cash and budgets (more)	70
Arrangements for translators (more)	90
Arrangements for room permits (more)	70
Locking cupboards and rooms (more)	70
Locating children and adults (more)	80
Collecting information about children (more)	80
Describing programs to new families (more)	80
Arrangements for interpretations (more)	80

Table B31

WAYS IN WHICH THE LOCAL SCHOOL LEAD INSTRUCTORS
HELP THE PRINCIPALS AND VICE-PRINCIPALS

Type of Help	Principals/ Vice-Principals (N = 16)	School Lead Instructors (N = 5)
	%	%
Program planning/Integrating with regular programs/Program research	75	20
Ordering/Maintaining equipment and supplies	69	-
Disciplining/Supervision/Management	69	40
Timetabling/Organizing	63	-
Paperwork/Registers/Monthly reports/Records/ Clerical tasks/Pay sheets	63	80
Substituting when instructors are absent	56	-
Help hiring instructors	50	20
Liaise with regular staff/between instructors and principals	50	80
Liaise with parents/Report to parents	25	60
Meet with/Support/Manage instructors	25	20
Student/Instructor attendance	25	-
Organizing for substitute instructors	19	20
Registration of students	19	-
Organization of meeting/storage/rest space	19	-
Assisting in evening programs/activities/ school-community activities	13	40
Local in-service/workshops	13	-
Orientation of new instructors	6	-
Liaise with other lead instructors	6	-
Help in transferring students	6	-
Supervising budgets of instructors	6	20
Prepare materials for instructors	6	-
Relate to children	6	-
Assist in classrooms	-	40
Hosting visitors	-	20

Table B32

WAYS IN WHICH THE LOCAL SCHOOL LEAD INSTRUCTORS
HELP THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANTS

Type of Help	Administrative Assistants (N = 10)	School Lead Instructors (N = 5)
	%	%
Disciplining children	30	20
Order/Distribute supplies	30	60
Pupil/Instructor attendance	30	40
Organizing	30	-
Unlock/lock classrooms	20	20
Moral support/Co-operation	20	-
Registration forms	20	20
Arrange for substitute instructors	20	-
Timetables	20	-
Orientation of new instructors	20	-
Translate/Interpret	10	-
Curriculum programming	10	-
Mail	10	-
Phone calls	10	-
Xeroxing	10	40
Meetings	10	-
Report cards	10	-
Student cards	10	-
Class lists	10	-
Liaise with regular staff	10	-
Paper work for TBE/Ministry	10	80
Locate missing kids	10	-
Liaise with parents	10	-
Typing	-	20
Substitute for administrative assistants	-	20
No help	10	-

Table B33

WAYS IN WHICH THE LOCAL SCHOOL LEAD INSTRUCTORS
HELP THE HL/BC/CC INSTRUCTORS*

	School Lead Instructors (N = 5)	HL Instructors (N = 11)	CC Instructors (N = 22)
	%	%	%
Order/maintain supplies	100	36	45
Liaise with regular staff/ administration	100	36	27
Discipline/Classroom management/ Monitoring	100	36	32
Assist with A.V. equipment	60	-	-
Programming/Advising/Supporting/ Organizing/Scheduling	60	36	14
Liaise with other instructors	60	-	-
Organize/Attend workshops	40	-	-
Integrate concurrent and heritage program	40	-	-
Substitute for instructors	40	-	-
Arrange for cupboard space	20	-	-
Arrange meetings	20	-	-
Prepare materials	20	18	-
Assist instructors with field trips	20	-	-
Assistant to instructors/ideas/ suggestions	20	27	18
Information for instructors	20	36	18
Meet with instructors	20	-	-
Community relations	20	-	-
Find substitutes for instructors	-	9	14
Budget	-	9	5
Moral support/Attention to needs	-	9	27
Paper work/class lists	-	9	14
Xeroxing	-	9	5
Model lessons	-	9	-
Entertainment/Socialization materials	-	9	-
Supervision of instructors	-	9	-
Lock/Unlock doors	-	-	14
Liaise with TBE	-	-	5
Liaise with parents	-	18	5

Table B33 (cont'd.)

WAYS IN WHICH THE LOCAL SCHOOL LEAD INSTRUCTORS
HELP THE HL/BC/CC INSTRUCTORS*

	School Lead Instructors (N = 5)	HL Instructors (N = 11)	CC Instructors (N = 22)
	%	%	%
Look for missing children	-	-	5
Enlisting new children	-	-	5
Attendance	-	-	5
Orientation to school and customs	-	-	5

*No BC instructors responded to the questionnaire.

Table B34

WAYS IN WHICH THE LANGUAGE LEAD INSTRUCTORS
HELP THE HERITAGE LANGUAGE INSTRUCTORS

Type of Help	Language Lead Instructors (N = 1)	Heritage Language Instructors (N = 11)
	%	%
Order/Maintain supplies/materials	100	55
Planning	100	-
Programming/Curriculum implementation	100	45
Provide/make materials	100	-
Integrate culture/language	100	-
Interpret procedures and policies	100	-
Information (meetings, etc.)	-	45
Ideas and suggestions	-	45
Discipline	-	27
Organizing/Scheduling	-	9
Liaise with parents	-	9
Moral support/Attend to needs	-	9
Supervision of instructors/Visiting classes	-	9
Model lessons	-	9
Provide personal materials	-	9
Workshops	-	9

Table B35

OTHER WAYS IN WHICH LANGUAGE LEAD
INSTRUCTORS HELP IN THE I/E DAY SCHOOLS

Type of Help	Language Lead Instructors (N = 1)
	%
Order/Maintain supplies/materials	100
Planning	100
Programming/Curriculum implementation	100
Provide/Make materials	100
Integrate culture/language	100
Interpret procedures and policies	100
Language games	100
Cultural activities	100
Model program after regular program	100

Table B36

**RESPONDENTS' OPINIONS ABOUT THE ROLE OF THE PARENTS
IN THE I/E DAY SCHOOLS**

Opinions	Principals/ Vice Principals (N = 16)		HL Instruc- tors (N = 11)		CC Instruc- tors (N = 22)		HL/BC Parents (N = 239)		CC Parents (N = 103)		HL & CC Parents (N = 65)		UI Parents (N = 42)	
	%		%		%		%		%		%		%	
Qualified to assist in hiring instructors	25		27		14		34		31		40		36	
Willing to assist in hiring instructors	81		64		*		46		51		52		38	
Qualified to assist in planning programs	6		27		*		38		35		*		*	
Willing to assist in planning programs	63		55		*		50		52		54		*	
Qualified to assist in evaluating programs	25		27		*		35		35		40		*	
Willing to assist in evaluating programs	56		46		*		47		53		51		*	

*50% or more of the respondents said "Don't Know" and/or did not respond.

Table B37

HAS THE INVOLVEMENT OF THE PARENTS OF CHILDREN
IN I/E DAY SCHOOLS CHANGED?

Respondents	Yes	No	Don't Know	No Response	Number of Respondents
	%	%	%	%	
HL/BC Parents	25	29	31	15	239
CC Parents	22	23	48	7	103
HL & CC Parents	29	34	20	17	65
UI Parents	14	19	43	24	42

Table B38

WAYS IN WHICH THE INVOLVEMENT OF THE PARENTS OF CHILDREN IN THE I/E DAY
SCHOOLS HAS CHANGED

Changes	HL/BC Parents (N = 239)		OC Parents (N = 103)		HL & CC Parents (N = 65)		UI Parents (N = 42)	
	%		%		%		%	
Planning programs (more)	11		7		19		12	
Attending meetings (more)	22		15		25		10	
Evaluating programs (more)	9		7		15		7	
Hiring staff (more)	8		5		19		7	
Communication with principal/vice-principal (more)	17		8		22		10	
Communication with regular teachers (more)	18		8		26		14	
Communication with instructors (more)	15		8		29		5	
Communication with other parents (more)	16		11		22		7	
Interaction with the media (more)	6		5		12		5	
Interaction with trustees (more)	10		5		19		2	
Interaction with administrators (more)	6		6		14		7	
Interaction with visitors to the school (more)	5		3		9		5	
Interaction with School Community Relations personnel (more)	9		5		14		7	
Negotiating between groups and individuals (more)	8		6		11		7	
Paperwork (more)	8		4		9		7	
Telephone communication (more)	7		5		14		5	
Written communication (more)	10		6		22		12	
Supplying materials from home (more)	5		4		12		7	
Volunteering in school programs (more)	8		6		12		7	
Involvement with politics (more)	5		5		9		5	
Public speaking (more)	8		6		12		10	

Table B39

ASSUMING THAT THE HL, BC AND OC PROGRAMS CONTINUE IN THE I/E DAY SCHOOLS,
WHAT CHANGES SHOULD BE MADE?

Changes	Principals/ Vice-Principals (N = 16)	Teachers (N = 130)	Administrative Assistants (N = 10)	Lead Instructors (N = 6)	HL Instructors (N = 11)	OC Instructors (N = 22)	HL/BC Parents (N = 239)	OC Parents (N = 103)	HL & OC Parents (N = 65)	UI Parents (N = 42)
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Put French in OC (concurrent programs)	44	32	•	17	9	36	37	40	46	48
Put English in OC	31	22	•	17	-	36	26	30	43	41
Put computers in OC	56	32	•	50	9	36	35	46	46	36
Do remedial work in OC	50	29	•	33	9	32	22	18	28	12
Do cross-cultural studies in OC	38	25	•	83	64	32	19	17	28	21
Have regular teachers do OC programs with pay	63	19	50	17	9	9	29	36	28	29
Provide more choices of OC program	25	26	•	-	46	27	23	38	34	26
Do more long range planning	25	32	60	67	55	73	23	20	37	21
Make HL/BC/OC programs more uniform by school	19	25	•	50	46	18	27	18	37	12
Combine small HL/BC/OC classes across schools	13	14	10	17	-	5	17	14	26	17
Integrate more into regular program	25	7	-	17	55	23	24	12	39	21
Give all Toronto Board schools the same additional resources	13	22	20	33	55	46	36	33	37	26
Improve procedures for ordering HL, BC and OC supplies	6	9	20	50	55	41	•	•	•	•
Provide a class for every heritage language in each school	13	19	-	17	55	32	34	24	32	14

Table B39 (cont'd.)

ASSUMING THAT THE HL, BC AND CC PROGRAMS CONTINUE IN THE I/E DAY SCHOOLS,
WHAT CHANGES SHOULD BE MADE?

Changes	Principals/ Vice-Principals (N = 16)	Teachers (N = 130)	Administrative Assistants (N = 10)	Lead Instructors (N = 6)	HL Instructors (N = 11)	CC Instructors (N = 22)	HL/BC Parents (N = 239)	CC Parents (N = 103)	HL & CC Parents (N = 65)	UI Parents (N = 42)
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Sort out priorities at the Toronto Board	81	54	60	50	•	27	•	•	•	•
Have HL/BC programs partly funded by parents	44	42	40	-	-	36	6	14	14	12
Transfer school staff in opposition	31	13	30	33	-	9	17	8	19	7
Better overall organization	25	38	50	50	46	27	26	18	37	26
More creativity in designing HL/BC/CC programs	19	32	•	50	18	36	25	23	34	12
More grouping by age in HL/BC/CC programs	25	26	•	17	64	32	26	23	32	14
More grouping by ability in HL/BC/CC programs	19	22	•	33	55	27	30	23	34	10
Improve student evaluation in HL/BC/CC programs	31	22	•	50	9	18	20	18	26	12
More homework in HL/BC/CC programs	-	5	•	-	27	-	28	18	34	14
More individual attention in HL/BC/CC programs	6	13	•	33	27	14	26	20	28	26
Incorporate better activities into HL/BC/CC programs	38	21	•	50	55	18	22	20	34	14
Deliver HL/BC/CC supplies on time	13	3	30	33	46	18	•	•	•	•
Update HL/BC/CC curriculum each year	25	21	•	33	46	9	27	23	45	24
Put HL/BC/CC marks in regular report cards	6	22	-	100	55	55	41	34	46	19

Table B39 (cont'd.)

ASSUMING THAT THE HL, BC AND OC PROGRAMS CONTINUE IN THE I/E DAY SCHOOLS,
WHAT CHANGES SHOULD BE MADE?

Changes	Principals/ Vice- Principals (n = 16)	Teachers (N = 130)	Administrative Assistants (N = 10)	Lead Instructors (N = 6)	HL Instructors (N = 11)	OC Instructors (N = 22)	HL/BC Parents (N = 239)	OC Parents (N = 103)	HL & OC Parents (N = 65)	UI Parents (N = 42)
Improve curriculum guidelines for instructors	63	33	•	67	46	50	21	21	28	17
More consideration for content of regular programs	38	38	•	17	9	23	•	•	•	•
Make HL, BC and OC programs more equal in status	38	12	•	33	64	23	24	22	26	5
Blend HL, BC and OC activities	25	6	•	83	9	27	11	15	25	12
Merge HL, BC and OC into cross-cultural programs	13	8	•	33	9	9	12	9	31	12
Create a resource center for HL/BC/OC programs	13	13	•	100	64	50	26	17	37	24
More emphasis on Canadian culture in HL/BC/OC programs	44	42	•	33	27	14	29	30	32	36
Give instructors fringe benefits	31	11	•	67	73	68	26	23	35	17
Pay instructors to get more training	44	15	•	67	100	41	23	28	46	33
Pay instructors for parent interviews/ meetings	44	8	•	83	91	59	20	21	35	14
Pay instructors for lesson preparation	13	7	•	33	73	64	19	17	29	14
Pay instructors for marking and report cards	25	6	•	50	64	41	16	14	19	12
Pay instructors for curriculum development	31	12	•	100	82	55	16	14	34	14
Increase hourly rate of pay for instructors	19	8	•	33	73	50	18	16	25	17
Pay lead instructors more	44	10	20	50	27	27	•	•	•	•
More frequent pay periods for instructors	-	3	20	33	46	59	•	•	•	•

Table B39 (cont'd.)

ASSUMING THAT THE HL, BC AND OC PROGRAMS CONTINUE IN THE I/E DAY SCHOOLS,
WHAT CHANGES SHOULD BE MADE?

Changes	Vice- Principals/ Principals (N = 16)	Teachers (N = 130)	Administrative Assistants (N = 10)	Lead Instructors (N = 6)	HL Instructors (N = 11)	OC Instructors (N = 22)	HL/BC Parents (N = 239)	OC Parents (N = 103)	HL & OC Parents (N = 65)	UI Parents (N = 42)
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Give instructors more work	19	2	•	33	27	41	15	11	19	14
Give instructors job security	19	12	•	67	82	55	33	28	37	26
Give instructors better schedules	19	9	•	83	73	41	•	•	•	•
Hire assistants for instructors	6	4	•	17	36	9	23	18	31	21
Provide more in-service and professional development for instructors	50	29	•	100	73	27	21	16	42	19
Unionize the instructors	-	9	10	33	64	23	11	10	14	12
Hire only instructors with Ontario teaching certificates	38	54	60	17	9	5	23	32	22	21
Hire only instructors with Toronto Board experience	-	13	10	-	9	5	13	11	25	19
Hire only instructors with good English	31	37	30	33	27	36	20	30	28	26
Pay principals more in I/E day schools	69	41	70	50	18	32	17	19	26	14
Pay vice-principals more in I/E day schools	63	37	50	33	9	27	12	13	22	10
Give all I/E day schools a vice-principal	94	46	40	17	18	23	14	9	26	7
Pay administrative assistants more in I/E day schools	63	39	80	33	9	27	9	11	20	10
Provide more clerical help in I/E day schools	100	59	50	50	27	27	18	20	35	17
Prepare principals better in I/E day schools	19	24	20	50	9	23	21	19	32	21
Prepare administrative assistants better	13	19	40	50	-	14	16	10	25	10

Table B39 (cont'd.)

ASSUMING THAT THE HL, BC AND CC PROGRAMS CONTINUE IN THE I/E DAY SCHOOLS,
WHAT CHANGES SHOULD BE MADE?

Changes	Principals/ Vice- Principals (N = 16)	Teachers (N = 130)	Administrative Assistants (N = 10)	Lead Instructors (N = 6)	HL Instructors (N = 11)	CC Instructors (N = 22)	HL/BC Parents (N = 239)	CC Parents (N = 103)	HL & CC Parents (N = 65)	UI Parents (N = 42)
Prepare regular teaching staff better	13	33	50	50	0	41	25	29	35	29
Increase familiarity and awareness of trustees	31	23	60	50	46	27	22	18	37	21
Increase familiarity and awareness of Board administrators	31	21	40	17	46	14	21	15	42	19
Better delineation of policy regarding supervision	56	31	30	33	9	9	•	•	•	•
Have principals and lead instructors meet as a group	13	16	•	50	18	27	•	•	•	•
Provide in-service for lead instructors	56	25	•	67	27	18	•	•	•	•
Better define the role of lead instructors	38	19	50	100	46	23	•	•	•	•
Improve administration and distribution of funds for HL/BC/CC programs	38	8	30	50	36	36	25	24	28	14
Provide funding for HL/BC/CC curriculum development	44	9	•	33	55	32	30	24	49	12
Increase funding for supplies and materials for HL/BC/CC programs	25	6	20	50	82	46	34	29	46	21
Make Toronto Board consultants available to instructors	44	16	•	33	18	32	•	•	•	•
Have Toronto Board take more responsibility for hiring instructors	38	29	•	50	36	5	35	41	46	26
More collaboration among instructors	31	14	•	17	46	41	•	•	•	•
More collaboration among lead instructors	25	10	•	33	9	27	•	•	•	•

Table B39 (cont'd.)

ASSUMING THAT THE HL, BC AND OC PROGRAMS CONTINUE IN THE I/E DAY SCHOOLS,
WHAT CHANGES SHOULD BE MADE?

Changes	Principals/ Vice- Principals (N = 16)	Principals (N = 130)	Administrative Assistants (N = 10)	Lead Instructors (N = 6)	HL Instructors (N = 11)	OC Instructors (N = 22)	HL/BC Parents (N = 239)	OC Parents (N = 103)	HL & OC Parents (N = 65)	UI Parents (N = 42)
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
More cooperation between parents and instructors	25	14	•	17	73	27	45	40	49	33
More commitment from Board administrators	44	12	50	17	36	18	23	22	43	19
More commitment from parents	38	19	40	50	36	14	26	26	37	31
More support from Toronto Teachers' Federation	31	9	20	83	55	23	31	31	46	24
Improve substitution procedures for instructors	50	•	•	67	36	46	•	•	•	•
Require longer notice for instructors firing and resignation	13	•	•	17	36	14	•	•	•	•
Decrease paperwork	75	•	•	-	27	14	•	•	•	•
Familiarize instructors with child development theory	69	•	•	83	36	41	35	40	51	33
Familiarize instructors with teaching methods of TBE	69	•	•	67	36	41	24	28	37	17
Familiarize instructors with effective classroom management techniques	75	•	•	83	64	50	32	28	45	24
Encourage instructors to act more professionally	38	•	•	•	•	•	31	28	42	21
Increase regular extra curricular activities	31	12	-	17	18	14	22	20	42	21

Table B39 (cont'd.)

ASSUMING THAT THE HL, BC AND CC PROGRAMS CONTINUE IN THE I/E DAY SCHOOLS,
WHAT CHANGES SHOULD BE MADE?

Changes	Principals/ Vice- Principals (N = 16)	Teachers (N = 130)	Administrative Assistants (N = 10)	Lead Instructors (N = 6)	HL Instructors (N=11)	CC Instructors (N = 22)	HL/BC Parents (N = 239)	CC Parents (N = 103)	HL & CC Parents (N = 65)	UI Parents (N = 42)
Increase regular remedial work	31	15	10	-	27	18	23	10	37	17
Encourage regular teachers to act more professionally	13	•	•	•	•	•	26	23	37	14
Provide guidelines about HL/BC/CC curriculum for parents	•	•	•	•	•	•	36	33	43	21

*This item was not asked of these respondents.

Table B40

ASSUMING THE HL CLASSES CONTINUE IN THE I/E DAY SCHOOLS, WHAT
CHANGES SHOULD BE MADE?

Changes	Lead Instructors (N = 6)	HL Instructors (N = 11)	HL Parents (N = 234)	HL & OC Parents (N = 65)	UI Parents (N = 42)
	%	%	%	%	%
More reading of HL	33	64	57	59	7
More writing of HL	33	55	54	54	7
More listening to HL	33	36	42	54	5
More speaking of HL	33	55	55	55	7
Teach more culture in HL class	50	46	39	52	2
Teach religion in HL class	-	9	17	22	5
Teach more history and geography of homeland in HL class	50	46	50	55	5

Table B41

ASSUMING THE BC CLASSES CONTINUE IN THE I/E DAY SCHOOLS,
WHAT CHANGES SHOULD BE MADE?*

Changes	Lead Instructors (N = 6)	BC Parents (N = 5)
	%	%
Present Black Culture/history more positively	17	60
Teach wider variety of Black Cultures	17	40

*No BC instructors returned a questionnaire.

Table B42

HL INSTRUCTORS' DESCRIPTIONS OF CHILDREN
IN HL CLASSES

Descriptions	HL Instructors (N = 11)
Tired and stressed	%
Problems going home	9
Happy	-
Respect and understand each other	100
Multicultural friendships	82
Relationships with instructors (good)	91
Punctual	100
Good attendance	82
Excel in HL	100
Self-confidence (good)	73
Identify with heritage	91
Understand culture and/or religion	91
Read HL well	82
Write HL well	82
Listen to HL well	55
Speak HL well	91
Motivated to learn HL (young children)	73
Motivated to learn HL (older children)	100
Get languages mixed up	91
Remember HL homework	27
Think the HL is important	82
Enjoy the change in pace	64
Are from many cultural backgrounds	91
Feel alienated	46
Understand the purpose of HL classes	-
	82

Table B43

CC INSTRUCTORS' DESCRIPTIONS OF CHILDREN
IN CC CLASSES

Descriptions	CC Instructors (N = 22)
	%
Tired and stressed	36
Problems going home	23
Happy	68
Respect and understand each other	36
Multicultural friendships	77
Relationships with instructors (good)	68
Punctual	68
Good attendance	91
Excel in concurrent activities	36
Self-confidence (good)	59
Motivated to learn/do concurrent activities (young children)	59
Motivated to learn/do concurrent activities (older children)	36
Think the concurrent class is important	36
Enjoy the change in pace	77
Are from many cultural backgrounds	100
Feel alienated	5
Understand the purpose of CC classes	14

Table B44

DOES THE I/E DAY AFFECT CHILDREN IN HERITAGE LANGUAGE
CLASSES DIFFERENTLY FROM OTHER TYPES OF HERITAGE
LANGUAGE CLASSES?

Respondents	Yes	No	Don't Know	No Response	Number of Respondents
	%	%	%	%	
HL parents	38	22	24	16	234
HL/CC parents	49	20	8	23	65

Table B45

WAYS IN WHICH THE I/E DAY AFFECT CHILDREN IN HERITAGE
LANGUAGE CLASSES DIFFERENTLY FROM OTHER TYPES OF
HERITAGE LANGUAGE CLASSES

Effect	HL Parents (N = 234)	HL/CC Parents (N = 65)
	%	%
Reading HL (better)	38	43
Writing HL (better)	36	40
Speaking HL (better)	40	43
Listening to HL (better)	35	37
Number of children enrolled in HL (more)	21	25
Supervision of HL class (better)	18	35
Overlap with night school HL classes (more)	8	15
Remember HL homework (more)	21	31
Communication with relatives (better)	36	42
Communication in community (better)	32	35
Understanding of culture and/or religion (better)	34	37

Table B46

DOES THE I/E DAY AFFECT CHILDREN IN BLACK CULTURAL
CLASSES DIFFERENTLY FROM OTHER TYPES OF
BLACK CULTURAL CLASSES?

Respondents	Yes	No	Don't Know	No Response	Number of Respondents
	%	%	%	%	
BC Parents	-	60	40	-	5

Table B47

ACTIVITIES AND METHODS MOST COMMONLY USED TO TEACH
HL AND CC CLASSES*

Activities and Methods	HL Instructors (N = 11)	CC Instructors (N = 22)
	%	%
Goal oriented games/Games/Contests	73	27
Music/Songs/Instruments/Singing	64	32
Crafts/Wallhangings/Silk Screens/Paper Mache	64	18
Communication/Speaking/Discussions	64	14
Reading Stories/Books	55	23
Art/Painting/Coloring	55	27
Telling Stories	45	27
Pictures	45	5
Writing books/Writing	27	9
Theater games/Skits/Plays	27	18
Films/Movies/Slides	18	23
Cooking	18	9
Flash cards	18	-
Dancing	18	5
Outdoor activities/Games	9	18
Puppetry	9	14
Clay work/Sculpture/Plasticine	9	9
Quizzes	9	-
Charts (alphabetic, pictures)	9	-
Trips	9	-
Translating	9	-
Card Playing	9	-
Modelling	9	-
Reciting	9	-
Tests	9	-
Note-taking/Dictation	9	-
Texts	9	-
Exercises/Warm-ups/Action songs	-	32
Hands-on experience/Learn by doing	-	27
Example of teacher/Demonstration	-	18
Praise/Postive reinforcement/Acceptance	-	14
Note-taking/Dictation	-	14
Musical games	-	9
Newspaper	-	9
Self-expression/Creativity	-	9
Lecturing	-	9
Imaginative activities/Novel activities	-	9
Peer tutoring	-	9
Use chalkboard	-	9
Straight-forward instruction	-	9
Rhythms	-	5
Listening to stories	-	5
Being happy and enthusiastic	-	5

Table B47 (cont'd.)

ACTIVITIES AND METHODS MOST COMMONLY USED TO TEACH
HL AND CC CLASSES*

Activities and Methods	HL Instructors (N = 11)	CC Instructors (N = 22)
	%	%
Disciplining	-	5
No homework	-	5
Simple activities	-	5
Total class participation	-	5
Hand-outs	-	5
Humor	-	5
Minimal direction	-	5
Observation	-	5
Teacher-student collaboration	-	5
Question-answer	-	5
Sequential teaching and learning	-	5
Problem solving	-	5
Displays	-	5
Groups	-	5
Pairing students	-	5
Use of holiday theme	-	5
Individualization	-	5

*No BC instructors returned questionnaires.

Table B48

MATERIALS MOST COMMONLY USED TO TEACH HL
AND CC CLASSES *

Materials	HL Instructors (N = 11)	CC Instructors (N = 22)
	%	%
Books/Texts/Magazines	73	27
Charts/Posters/Pictures	64	9
Mural paper/Construction paper/Crepe paper/ Back board	45	9
Flash cards/Cards	36	9
Films/Videos/A.V./Projectors	27	23
Copier/Xeroxed materials	27	-
Tapes/Tape recorder/Cassettes	18	18
Colored markers	18	23
Blackboard	18	14
Plasticine	18	9
Crayons	18	9
Cardboard	9	9
Paint	9	18
Slide projectors	9	9
Building toys/Toys	9	9
Games/Self-made games	9	9
Note books	9	14
Cultural materials	9	-
Flipcharts	9	-
Paper	-	55
Pencils/Pens	-	36
Glue/Paste	-	23
Cloth	-	18
Musical instruments (Orff)	-	14
Thread/Ribbons/Wool	-	9
Scissors	-	9
Records	-	9
Wood	-	9
Clay	-	9

Table B48 (cont'd.)

MATERIALS MOST COMMONLY USED TO TEACH HL
AND CC CLASSES*

Materials	HL Instructors (N = 11)	CC Instructors (N = 22)
	%	%
Typewriters	-	9
Wallpaper books	-	9
Baking utensils	-	9
VCR	-	9
Music books/Manuals/Song books	-	9
Brushes	-	9
Novel objects	-	9
Puzzles	-	9
Ink	-	9
Bandages	-	9
Mathematical sets	-	9
Overhead projector	-	9
Computers	-	9
Computer software and materials	-	9
Bulletin Board	-	9
Gym equipment/Sports	-	9
Buttons	-	9
Groceries	-	9
Plaster	-	9
Wire	-	9
Rulers	-	9
Erasers	-	9
Masking tape	-	9
Costumes	-	9
Puppets	-	9
Camera	-	9

*No BC instructors returned questionnaires.

Table B49

OTHER MATERIALS INSTRUCTORS WOULD LIKE
TO TEACH HL AND CC CLASSES*

Materials	HL Instructors (N = 11)	CC Instructors (N = 22)
	%	%
Films/Video/A.V./Projectors	45	14
Tapes/Tape recorders/Cassettes	45	9
Books/Texts/Magazines	27	9
Cultural materials	18	-
Paint	9	-
Brushes	9	-
Building toys/Toys	9	-
Games/Self-made games	9	-
Typewriters	9	5
Blackboard	9	-
Charts/Posters/Pictures	9	-
Computers	9	9
Crayons	9	-
Copier	9	5
Small library	9	-
Cooking recipes	9	-
Film production procedures	9	-
Personal classroom	9	5
Art/Craft materials	-	18
Paper	-	14
Musical instruments (Orff)	-	14
Building tools (saws, hammers)	-	14
Pencils/Pens	-	5
Mural paper/construction paper/Crepe paper/ Back board	-	5
Wood	-	5
Coloured markers	-	5
Note books	-	5
Computer software/materials	-	5
Gym equipment/Sports	-	5
Hats/Old clothes	-	5

TABLE B49 (cont'd.)

2

OTHER MATERIALS INSTRUCTORS WOULD LIKE
TO TEACH HL AND CC CLASSES*

Materials	HL Instructors (N = 11)	CC Instructors (N = 22)
	%	%
Play makeup	-	5
Play sets	-	5
Tac Board	-	5
Science Supplies	-	5
Sewing machine	-	5
Animals	-	5
Clothes pegs	-	5
Popsicle sticks	-	5
Candle making	-	5
Food dye	-	5
Soap flakes	-	5
Outside resource people	-	5

*No BC instructors returned the questionnaires.

Table B50

SOURCES OF MATERIALS USED IN HL AND CC CLASSES*

Source	HL Instructors (N = 11)	CC Instructors (N = 22)
	%	%
Toronto Board of Education	82	45
Instructors themselves	27	32
Libraries	18	9
School resource centers	18	-
Friends	18	-
Ethnic cultural and education center	14	-
Home products from parents and children	9	23
Children's Book Store	9	5
School Library	9	9
American bookstore	9	-
Ethnic book stores	9	-
Children	9	-
Newspapers	9	-
Other Canadian locations	9	-
Other countries	9	-
Art Store	-	14
Arts Junction	-	9
Found objects (nuts, flowers, leaves)	-	9
Regular teacher	-	9
TBE CC/HL Departments	-	9
Toy-lending libraries	-	5
Hobby stores	-	5
Faculty of Music (U of T)	-	5
Lead instructors	-	5
Grocery store	-	5
St. John's Ambulance	-	5
Secretary	-	5
Principal	-	5

*No BC instructors returned questionnaires.

Table B51

WHAT ARE RESPONDENTS' OPINIONS ABOUT REGULAR SCHOOL PROGRAMS IN TORONTO
ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS? WHAT CHANGES SHOULD BE MADE?

Changes	Principals/ Vice- Principals (N = 16)	Teachers (N = 130)	Administrative Assistants (N = 10)	Lead Instructors (N = 6)	HL Instructors (N = 11)	CC Instructors (N = 22)	HL/BC Parents (N = 239)	CC Parents (N = 103)	HL & CC Parents (N = 65)	UI Parents (N = 42)
Basics (more)	*	*	50	*	*	59	*	*	60	*
English (more)	*	*	60	*	*	50	*	*	63	52
French (more)	*	*	50	*	*	*	*	*	48	*
Homework (more)	*	*	*	*	*	*	57	52	66	48
Individual attention (more)	75	51	60	*	*	68	53	62	52	50
Grouping by ability	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Parent involvement (more)	*	*	50	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Uniform curriculum	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Classes (smaller)	75	75	80	*	55	64	*	57	*	*
Discipline (better)	*	*	50	83	73	50	*	52	54	*
Student evaluation	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Reporting to parents (better)	50	*	*	*	*	*	*	60	51	*
Teachers	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Books (more)	56	*	*	50	64	*	*	51	57	*
Computers (more)	81	*	50	*	*	*	*	65	63	*

*50% or more of the respondents did not check the item therefore indicating they felt there should be no change either way.

APPENDIX C
TABLES C1 - C12

Table C1

GRADE DISTRIBUTION OF HL/BC PUPILS

Grade	HL/BC Pupils (N = 103)
	%
5	21.4
4	19.4
6	17.5
3	16.5
2	11.7
1	5.8
7	2.9
8	1.0
No information	3.9

Table C2

HERITAGE CLASSES IN WHICH HL/BC PUPILS WERE ENROLLED

Heritage Language Class	HL/BC Pupils (N = 103)
	%
Portuguese	25.2
Chinese	23.3
Italian	12.6
Greek	11.6
Spanish	10.7
Hindi	4.9
Urdu	3.9
Black Cultural	3.9
Arabic	1.9
Panjabi	1.0
Vietnamese	1.0

Table C3

LANGUAGE USAGE WITH PARENTS, SIBLINGS,
SCHOOL PEERS AND COMMUNITY PEERS

HL/BC PUPILS (N = 103)

Language Used Most	With Parents	With Siblings	With School Peers	With Community Peers
	%	%	%	%
English	30.1	67.0	79.6	72.8
Chinese	17.5	5.8	1.9	2.9
Portuguese	16.5	-	-	-
Both English and HL	8.7	11.7	6.8	6.8
Italian	4.9	1.0	-	-
Greek	3.9	1.0	-	-
Spanish	3.9	-	-	-
Panjabi	1.9	1.9	-	-
Vietnamese	1.9	-	-	-
Kachi	1.9	-	-	-
Urdu	1.0	-	-	-
Laotian	1.0	-	-	-
Latvian	1.0	-	-	-
Gujarati	1.0	-	-	-
English and Mother's HL	1.0	-	-	-
English and non-HL	-	-	1.0	2.0
Not applicable	-	1.0	-	-
No information	3.8	10.7	10.7	15.5

Table C4

LIKES ABOUT HL/BC CLASSES

Likes	HL/BC Pupils (N = 103)
	%
Instructor	25.2
Games	21.4
Writing	19.4
Reading	15.5
Enjoys/like class (with no elaboration)	15.5
Colouring/drawing	15.5
Singing songs	7.8
Class is fun	7.8
Stories	6.8
Speaking/oral work	5.8
Plays	4.9
Books	3.9
It is easy	3.9
Language learning in general	3.9
Special projects	3.9
Outdoor activities/races/gym	3.9
Better command of HL	2.9
Making holiday decorations	2.9
Poems	2.9
Sounds of the language	2.9
Festival planning/preparation	2.9
Puzzles	2.9
Friends are in the same class	2.9
Movies	2.9
Religious stories/Koran	2.9
Treats	2.9
Pupils are helpful	2.9
Everything	1.9
Learns new vocabulary	1.9
Arts and crafts	1.9

Table C4 (cont'd.)

LIKES ABOUT HL/BC CLASSES

Likes	HL/BC Pupils (N = 103)
	%
Listening to music/playing musical instruments	1.9
Dancing	1.9
Working	1.9
Learning about culture/famous people	1.9
Miscellaneous responses mentioned once by one pupil	16.5
No likes	6.8
No response	3.9

Table C5

DISLIKES ABOUT HL/BC CLASSES

Dislikes	HL/BC Pupils (N = 103)
	%
No dislikes	25.2
Too noisy/too much talking/shouting	15.5
Writing the HL/very hard	9.7
Pupil distrubed/bugged by other pupils/can't work	7.8
Instructor yells when children talk	6.8
Boys bothering girls/boys misbehave	5.8
Doesn't learn much	5.8
Lack of interesting activities/boring/no challenge	4.9
Reading	4.9
Pupils call each other names	3.9
Homework/assignments	3.9
Poor discipline	3.9
Too much work/work	2.9
Copying from blackboard	2.9
Spelling	2.9
Different ages in class	2.9
Instructor (no elaborations)	2.9
Dictation	1.9
Memorization	1.9
When instructor tells/reads story in HL	1.9
Colouring	1.9
Too much repetition	1.9
Class is too short	1.9
Instructor is mean/abusive	1.9
Class is too easy	1.9
Language learning in general	1.9
Instructor won't let pupils go to washroom	1.9
Instructor sends pupils to the office	1.9
Instructor is too strict	1.9
Miscellaneous response mentioned by one pupil	20.3
No response	2.9

Table C6

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS ABOUT HL/BC CLASSES

Comments	HL/BC Pupils (N = 103)
	%
Parents want child in HL/BC class	42.7
Child wants to be in HL/BC class	39.8
Learns to write HL	34.0
Learns to read HL	26.2
Learns to speak HL	21.4
Many ages in HL/BC class	14.6
Parents want child/child wants to communicate better with relatives	14.6
Pupil would like to be in CC class	14.6
Pupil has visited homeland	12.6
Parents want child to learn a different/more language(s)	8.7
Parents want child to communicate better in visits to homeland	8.7
Discipline problems in HL/BC class also take place in regular class	7.8
Instructor/pupils use a lot of English	7.8
Pupil doesn't like HL/BC class very much	7.8
Parents insist against pupil's wishes to go to HL/BC class	6.8
Parents like/plan to move back to homeland	6.8
The extended day is not too long/don't feel tired	5.8
Pupil chooses HL/BC class because friends are there	5.8
Pupil doesn't mind class of varied ages/likes it	5.8
Pupil prefers HL/BC class during the school day	4.9
Pupil likes regular class/teacher more	4.9
French is pupil's favorite language	4.9
Pupil learns vocabulary	4.9
Older children help younger ones in HL/BC class	3.9
CC class doesn't interest pupils/don't want to go to CC class	3.9
Pupil reads Koran at home	2.9
Pupil uses HL in the community	2.9
Pupil learns a lot of general knowledge from HL/BC class	2.9

Table C6 (cont'd.)

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS ABOUT HL/BC CLASSES

Comments	HL/BC Pupils (N = 103)
	%
Pupil also attends HL night class	2.9
Pupil spends time in HL class doing other things (e.g. homework for regular class)	2.9
Pupil prefers after-school/Saturday morning HL class	2.9
Pupil likes HL class more than regular class	1.9
Parents want pupil to learn HL to teach them	1.9
Pupil gets no choice of not attending I/E day	1.9
Many pupils in HL class do not have same heritage (e.g. English and other groups in Spanish HL class)	1.9
Some pupils in HL class do not understand HL	1.9
Pupil wants to learn HL to better communicate with friends	1.9
Pupil thinks HL is important	1.9
Pupil learns culture/history	1.9
Pupil misses extra-curricular activities	1.9
There are no HL books in class	1.9
Miscellaneous responses mentioned by one pupil	33.0

Table C7

GRADE DISTRIBUTION OF CONCURRENT PUPILS

Grade	CC Pupils (N = 59)
	%
6	30.5
5	22.0
3	13.6
4	11.9
2	5.1
7	3.4
8	3.4
1	1.7
No information/not clear	8.5

Table C8

TYPES OF CONCURRENT CLASSES IN WHICH PUPILS WERE ENROLLED

Concurrent Classes	CC Pupils (N = 59)
	%
Art	13.6
Arts/Crafts	8.5
Arts/Crafts/Plays/Music	6.8
Problem solving techniques	6.8
Dance	6.8
Arts/Puppetry	6.8
Karate	6.8
Drama	5.1
Story-telling	3.4
Sports/Drama/Murals	3.4
Cartooning	3.4
Computer	3.4
Journalism	3.4
Painting/Drama	3.4
Music	3.4
Music/Drama	1.7
Book Binding	1.7
Art/Gym	1.7
Sports/Drama/Calligraphy	1.7
Art/Writing/Crafts	1.7
No information/not clear	6.8

Table C9

LIKES ABOUT THE CONCURRENT CLASSES

Likes	CC Pupils (N = 59)
	%
Instructor	28.8
Class is fun	20.3
Class in general/everything	18.6
Plays/drama/performing	18.6
Art	16.9
Games	15.2
Painting/colouring/drawing	10.2
Listening to music/different kinds	8.4
Dance/break dancing	6.8
Learning self defense	6.8
Exercises/aerobic movements	5.1
Mindstorm/brainstorm problems	5.1
Learning something worthwhile	5.1
Computer games/compose music/write stories with computers	5.1
Stories/tales/jokes	5.1
Bottles	3.4
Casts	3.4
Problem solving	3.4
Making crafts	3.4
Making puppets	3.4
Projects/decorations for holidays	3.4
Miscellaneous response mentioned once by one pupil	20.3
No response/no information/not clear	6.8

Table C10

DISLIKES ABOUT THE CONCURRENT CLASSES

Dislikes	CC Pupils (N = 59)
	%
Pupils are undisciplined/shout/mean to each other/ don't listen to instructor	27.1
A certain kind of exercise	8.5
Too much repeated activities/boring	6.8
Pupil not too keen on/dislikes CC class/feels forced	6.8
Unhappy with other pupils in class	6.8
Instructor not understanding/uses old method/gets angry	5.1
Pupil sent to principal	5.1
Mixed ages in class	3.4
Class does not meet pupil's expectation	3.4
Pupil can't finish work	3.4
Miscellaneous response mentioned by one pupil	15.2
No dislikes	28.8
No information/not clear	18.6

Table C11

TYPES OF ACTIVITIES IN CONCURRENT CLASSES

Types of Activities	CC Pupils (N = 59)
	%
Drama/plays	23.7
Art/design	22.0
Stories (write, tell, read)	11.9
Paint	11.9
Fitness/sports/exercise	11.9
Games	11.9
Singing songs	8.5
Music	6.8
Crafts	6.8
Problem solving	6.8
Sketching/drawing	6.8
Dance	6.8
Puppets	6.8
Karate	6.8
English	5.1
Musical instruments	5.1
Movies	5.1
Rhythms/beats	5.1
Pictures	5.1
Records	3.3
Group work	3.3
Cartooning	3.3
Computers	3.3
Clapping exercises	3.3
Masks	3.3
Casts	3.3
Writing/journalism	3.3
Miscellaneous activities mentioned by one pupil	28.8
No information/not clear	3.3

Table C12

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS ABOUT CC CLASSES

Comments	CC Pupils (N = 59)
	%
Most of the pupil's friends are in CC	18.6
CC has fewer than 15 pupils	15.3
Pupil prefers CC to going home early/HL class	15.3
Mixed ages in class	13.6
Pupil doesn't mind mixed ages	10.2
Extended day is not too long/pupil not tired	10.2
Pupil does not miss extracurricular sports/extracurricular sports not affected	10.2
Parents want pupil in CC	8.5
Pupil likes/benefits more from/regular class than CC	8.5
Pupil prefers doing own work/go home early/HL class to CC	8.5
Pupil/parents do not like the longer day/less time after school/tired/no time to see each other	8.5
Poor discipline	6.8
HL programs good for ethnic groups	5.1
There should be an HL class for all languages	5.1
Pupil takes CC seriously	5.1
Pupil would like a different CC	3.4
Pupil misses extracurricular activities	3.4
Parents are pleased with computer class	3.4
Would like to be in class with only pupils from own ethnic group	3.4
Would like more things to do/field trips in CC	3.4
Comments that were mentioned by one pupil	35.6
No additional comments	15.3

APPENDIX D

SUMMARIES OF INTERVIEWS OF PUPILS IN I/E DAY SCHOOLS

Children in Heritage Languages Classes (A to Y)

Children in Black Cultural Classes (Z and ZZ)

Children in Concurrent Classes (AA to YY)

Children in Heritage Language Classes

Pupil A

A is a grade four pupil who has been in a Portuguese language class for three years. She was born in Canada, but her parents and brothers were born in Portugal.

She communicates with her parents in Portuguese and with her brothers in English. She uses primarily English but some Portuguese with her friends at school and all English with her friends around home. She listens to only English radio and watches only English television. There are no newspapers and books in her home.

Her parents want her in the Portuguese class so that she can improve her communication with them. A agrees with them and likes the program. She says that in class they spend most of their time practising speaking Portuguese followed by reading activities. She likes the reading activities best. However, A does not enjoy writing Portuguese as it takes so long and the instructor goes too fast.

In addition to English and Portuguese, A is also studying French. A maintains she does not get the languages mixed up and knows English best.

Pupil B

B is a grade three pupil in a Chinese language class. B and his parents were born in Vietnam and came to Canada when he was very young. At home, he speaks Chinese with his parents and siblings. When asked if the Chinese he speaks at home is the same as that taught in the Chinese class, he said "yes". B reported that he also speaks Chinese with his friends around home but uses English with his friends at school. At home, he watches television and reads newspapers and books in both English and Chinese. There is no radio in the home.

B's parents want him in the Chinese class so that he speaks more Chinese. B says he wants to be in the class.

B says that in Chinese class they sing songs, write and read. He likes the writing best but does not care for the singing.

Pupil C

C is a grade four pupil in a Chinese language class who was born in Thailand and came to Canada four years ago. C speaks Lao with her parents but English with her sister. She speaks English with her friends at home and at school. At home, she watches English television and sometimes reads Chinese newspapers and books.

C's parents want her in the Chinese class so that she will be able to communicate with relatives who speak Chinese. C also wants to be in the class.

In addition to learning English, Lao and Chinese, C is studying French. C says her best language is English and that she sometimes gets English and Chinese mixed up because she doesn't know Chinese very well.

In Chinese class, she likes writing best.

Pupil D

D is a grade two pupil in a Greek language class. D was born in Canada; his parents were born in Greece. D speaks mostly English and some Greek with his parents and siblings. He speaks English with his friends at home and at school. At home he watches English television, listens to English radio and reads English newspapers and books. However, he and his family sometimes watch Greek videos. D says his best language is Greek.

D says his parents want him to be in the Greek language class because it is their language and they like it. They want him to learn Greek so he can talk to them more often in that language.

D says he likes the Greek language class. He says he used to go to Greek night school, but he didn't like it because it was very long with no recess and was too much work. He used to get tired in Greek night class.

In this Greek class, D says they use only Greek. They speak, write and sing in Greek. The instructor reads them Greek stories and tells them about Greek men that have died. He says there are no Greek books in the class. D most likes singing in Greek and listening to the instructor read in Greek. He dislikes writing Greek because it takes a long time. He complains that the instructor does not let the pupils go to the washroom.

Pupil E

E is a grade six pupil in a Hindi language class. E has attended this school since Kindergarten. This is the first year that E has attended a Hindi language class, since it is the first year that it has been offered in this school. E was born in Canada; his parents were born in India. E speaks mostly English with his parents and siblings, although they also use lots of Hindi. E says his best language is English, followed by Hindi and then French.

E's parents want him in Hindi class so that he learns more of the language; E would rather be in the Concurrent class.

In Hindi class, E says they learn new words by writing them on the blackboard, saying them and then copying them into their books. They also read Hindi books and use game cards. E says he likes the game cards best but is generally unhappy in the class because he does not learn much.

E reports that while the class has only nine pupils in it, they range in age from five through eleven years. E says it is difficult for the instructor to teach children of so many different ages. E feels he might complain to the instructor that he does not teach the vowels.

Pupil F

F is a grade three pupil in an Urdu language class. She says she was born in Canada, but she is not sure where her parents were born. She speaks Kachi and sometimes English to her parents. To her little brother, she speaks English and sometimes Kachi. She says that Kachi is an Indian language that is similar to Urdu. With her friends around home, she speaks English and sometimes Urdu, while she uses only English with her friends at school.

F's parents want her in the Urdu language class so that she can learn Urdu and then teach it to them. Her parents want to learn Urdu so they can communicate with her aunt who speaks Urdu.

F herself wants to learn Urdu so she can communicate better with some of her own friends who speak Urdu. She says she already knows Kachi.

F watches English television and listens to English radio. Sometimes she listens to Indian radio. At home, she reads newspapers and books in English because she cannot read Urdu.

F says she knows four languages: English best, French second best, followed by Urdu and then Kachi.

In Urdu class, F says they write in both Urdu and English, do translations, sing some songs, say a lot of prayers, read sentences and read the small Koran. She particularly likes the puzzles and outside games and races they do. She says it is a small class of mostly younger children. F gets upset in class when the boys bother her.

Pupil G

G is a grade four pupil who is in a Portuguese language class. G was born in Canada; her parents were born in Portugal. She has two siblings. She communicates in Portuguese with her parents. With her friends at school, she uses English, with her friends at home she uses mostly English, sometimes Portuguese. She says her best language is English.

This is G's first year in this school and also her first year in a Portuguese integrated class.

G's mother wants her to learn more Portuguese so her daughter can communicate with her better, as well as with G's grandparents who live next door and speak only Portuguese.

In Portuguese class, G says they are mostly learning to read Portuguese. They are also learning to write by copying from the blackboard. They do plays in Portuguese. G likes the reading activities best and has no complaints about the class.

Pupil H

H is a grade five pupil in a Vietnamese language class. She and her parents were born in Vietnam and they communicate primarily in Vietnamese. She has many brothers and sisters with whom she uses more English than Vietnamese. With her friends at school and around home, she uses all English. H watches English television and Vietnamese videos. She listens to English and Vietnamese radio stations and reads books at home in both languages.

H says her best language is English, followed by Vietnamese and then French.

This is H's first year in the Vietnamese language class. Her parents want her to learn more Vietnamese so she can talk to them better, write to her grandmother and read Vietnamese books. She is not sure whether the family will return to Vietnam.

H wants to be in the Vietnamese class and intends to enroll next year.

In Vietnamese class, H says they sound words, write letters, read stories, sing songs and study maps. H likes everything about the class but sometimes can't think of what to write when the instructor asks her to write a story in Vietnamese.

Pupil I

I is a grade six pupil in an Italian language class. I was born in Canada; his parents were born in Italy. While I speaks mostly Italian and only a little English with his parents, he speaks all English to his siblings, friends at home and friends at school.

I's parents want him in the Italian class to improve his Italian, since his grandparents are coming to Canada and they speak only Italian.

I thinks he might like the Concurrent class where art is taught but goes to Italian class regardless.

I says the Italian class helps him improve his speaking and writing skills. In Italian class, he says they have films, plays and games. They write, sing and copy Italian. They talk about grapes and wine. I especially likes the plays. However, he feels discouraged about the large volume of writing his instructor expects them to copy from the blackboard.

I says the Italian class is different because pupils of various cultures are not mixed together as in the regular class. He says he has friends from all cultures and likes it best when they are mixed together.

Pupil J

J is a grade five pupil in a Portuguese language class. J and her brothers and sisters were born in Canada. Her parents, with whom she communicates mostly in Portuguese, were born in Portugal. J uses all English with her siblings and friends at school, although she does use a little Portuguese with some of her friends around home.

J has been in Portuguese classes for five years. She and her parents are keen that she learn as much Portuguese as possible, as they intend to return to Portugal. J is also learning French in school. She says her best language is Portuguese, followed by English and then French.

Pupil K

K is a grade six pupil in a Greek language class. K was born in Canada while her parents were born in Greece. K speaks English with her father and Greek with her mother. She uses English with all her friends at school and around home. She and her brother communicate primarily in English but also use a little Greek. K says her best language is English, followed by Greek and then French.

K has been taking Greek language classes for five years and says she has learned quite a lot, particularly in the areas of reading, writing, geography and history. She says they are now learning Greek songs for Christmas.

K also goes to Greek language classes on Saturday mornings and maintains she likes it better because of some of the activities such as dancing and "close the words". K says the integrated class is too short. K says her parents do not like the integrated/extended day because they think it interrupts pupils in learning their English and makes the young children tired and forces them to go home in the dark.

K's integrated Greek class has only thirteen pupils in it, but they range in age from five through eleven years.

K likes learning Greek history and geography.

Pupil L

L is a grade five pupil in a Spanish language class. L was born in Canada and comes from a family with an English-speaking background.

L is in the Spanish language class because his rather frequently does business in Spanish-speaking countries such as Chile and Argentina and has his family accompany him on his business trips. L wants to learn some Spanish so that these trips are more enjoyable.

This is L's second year in the Spanish class, and he says he is learning to read Spanish. L says that he and his family sometimes practise Spanish at home and have at times gone to Spanish movies and restaurants in Toronto.

L says that the thing he likes best about the class is the "sound" of the Spanish language. He finds the assignments, especially writing, very difficult.

According to L, there are just ten pupils in the class, only one of whom is a Spanish-speaking pupil.

L's parents let him make up his own mind about whether he will attend Heritage Language or Concurrent class.

Pupil M

M is a grade four pupil in a Portuguese language class. M was born in Canada; his parents were born in Portugal. M speaks mostly Portuguese with his parents - sometimes a little English with his father. M speaks only English with his siblings and friends at school and friends around home. M says his best language is English, followed by Portuguese and then French. He says he sometimes mixes the languages up a little.

At home, M watches English television, listens to English radio and reads English books. There are times though, when he also tunes into Portuguese television and radio.

M has been in an integrated Portuguese class for two years, wants to be there and likes it. His parents want him to learn more Portuguese, as they believe he will be able to make use of it when they visit Portugal.

In Portuguese class, M says they do more writing activities than anything else, although they also speak and read Portuguese as well as draw and color. M likes the writing, drawing and coloring but does not care as much for the reading. M gets upset when the other pupils disturb him and don't let him work.

According to M, there are sixteen pupils in the class, varying widely in age. M says he is the oldest in the class and doesn't mind the younger children being there.

Pupil N

N is a grade six pupil who attends Greek class. His father came from Greece while his mother came from Scotland. N, however, was born in Canada.

N talks to his parents, sister and most of his friends in English. He reads some Greek books and watches Greek television programs at home. Sometimes he goes to Greek movies with his father. N also attends Greek church with his family. He has visited Greece once and may visit the country again.

His father wanted him to enrol in Greek class, but N would have chosen to attend Greek class on his own. He likes the Greek class because the instructor shows movies about Greek gods every two weeks and teaches about many interesting places in Greece.

N wishes that the pupils would make less noise and remember to bring their textbooks. Another suggestion N made was to have more Greek homework, because just classroom work is not enough for a serious learner.

N used to attend Greek class after school two times a week for 2 1/2 to 3 hours per session. He felt that he learned more in the evening class than the day class because of the longer instruction time.

Pupil O

O is a grade five pupil attending Arabic class. Her father is from South Africa and had lived in the United States before moving to Toronto. Her mother came from England.

O uses English all the time with her parents, siblings and friends. Sometimes she uses simple Arabic with her parents' friends. O reads some Arabic books at home in addition to the Koran. She does not watch Arabic television, although her father does.

She also learns French in school. She manages not to get the languages mixed up, even though some French and Arabic words are similar.

O finds that pupils generally do not behave as well in Arabic class as in regular class. The boys tend to read sports magazines while the girls tend to talk a lot during Arabic class.

O does not find learning the Arabic language that useful but says it is always fun to learn languages. She feels she can listen to and understand Arabic better after attending the class but still cannot speak the language very well.

Pupil P

P is a fifth grader attending Chinese Heritage Language class. She speaks Chinese mostly with her grandparents, parents and brothers. Although most of P's friends are Chinese, she still prefers to use English with them.

P's parents want her to attend Heritage Language class and she wants to go too, because she enjoys it. She has attended Chinese Heritage Language class since Kindergarten, and she still wants to go next year.

She learns to read and write Chinese from her Heritage Language class. However, she does not do any Chinese reading and writing outside of the classroom.

P also learns French in school. Of the three languages, she finds that she is most fluent in English and least fluent in French.

Pupil Q

Q is a Canadian-born grade two pupil attending Spanish Heritage Language class. Her parents come from Ecuador and have plans of moving the family back to Ecuador next year.

Q talks to her parents in Spanish and to her brother and friends in English. They do not have relatives in Toronto but some in New York whom they visit quite often. She always speaks English with these relatives.

She reads some Spanish books at home and watches Spanish television programs. The only time she writes Spanish at home is when she does her Spanish homework.

Q has attended after-school Spanish class in the past. Her parents want her to go to Spanish class during the regular school day this year. She likes her Spanish class because the books are fun and the instructor gives parties.

Pupil R

R is a Chinese Heritage Language pupil whose parents are from China. She is in grade one now and has attended Chinese Heritage Language class since Kindergarten.

R communicates with her parents in Chinese. She uses English with her older brothers and with her friends, most of whom are Chinese. She watches Chinese television programs, reads Chinese books and writes Chinese at home.

She enjoys her Chinese class, especially the toys, books and the instructor and would like to continue next year. She feels she gains a lot of knowledge from the class, such as how to take care of pets, in addition to learning the language.

The only complaint she has about the class is the misbehavior of the boys. This is, however, not unique to the Chinese class because it happens in other classes too.

Pupil S

S is a grade two pupil of Anglo background attending an Italian Heritage Language class. Her parents encouraged her to learn a new language. Since many of S's school friends are Italian, she chose to enrol in Italian class.

Only English is used at home. She also uses English exclusively with her friends. She watches only English television and reads English books at home.

S has not learned to write and read Italian yet because she just got started in the new language. She likes the instructor, enjoys colouring, making festive decorations and doing projects in the Italian class. She thinks she will continue in the same class next year.

Pupil T

T is a Canadian-born grade two pupil attending Panjabi class. Both parents came from India. T has visited India once but was too young to remember anything about the country.

T uses some Panjabi but mostly English with his parents. He uses English all the time with his sister as well as with his friends, most of whom are of Indian origin.

He watches Panjabi video cassettes with his parents at home but only partly understands them. He neither reads nor writes Panjabi at home.

T's parents want him to go to Panjabi class, and he likes to learn the language, especially the writing. He was in Panjabi Heritage Language class last year and has decided to continue next year. He has no concerns about getting the languages mixed up.

Pupil U

U is in grade five attending an Italian Heritage Language class. He was born in Canada, but his parents are from Italy. He uses English with his parents, siblings and friends.

He has been attending Italian Heritage Language class since grade one. He quit last year because he did not like the instructor. U explained that the Italian instructor was too strict compared with his regular teacher. U had been sent out of the classroom for talking more than once. He is enrolled in Italian class this year because his parents wanted him to return and also because he will be going with his parents to Italy for a visit this summer.

U quite enjoys his Italian class this year because of the games the instructor uses in teaching them new Italian words. He wishes he had more chances to use the Italian words outside of the classroom.

Pupil V

V is a grade seven immigrant pupil enrolled in Chinese class. He was born in China and moved to Canada four years ago. This is also his first year in this senior school. The junior school he attended did not offer Chinese Heritage Language class, and he has not attended any Saturday or evening Heritage Language classes.

He speaks Chinese with his parents but English with his brother. He uses both Chinese and English with his Chinese friends, but English with friends of other ethnic backgrounds.

V does not read Chinese books or newspapers at home but likes to watch Chinese television. He also has a chance to use his Chinese when going to the Chinese restaurants.

V says he tends to take the Chinese class less seriously than the regular class because the language instructor gives less work.

He thinks it is likely that he will choose the Chinese class over a Concurrent class next year.

Pupil W

W is a grade three, Canadian-born pupil in Chinese Heritage Language class. His parents came from China. W has never had a chance to visit his parents' birthplace.

W's parents want him to go to Chinese class because they feel he does not speak enough Chinese at home. He talks to them in both English and Chinese and to his sisters entirely in English. He uses English with his friends, most of whom are Canadians.

He does not read any Chinese materials at home but takes time to do some Chinese writing. When he watches Chinese television, he does not fully understand the programs.

W likes the Chinese class, especially writing and doing arts and crafts. He would like to continue next year.

He just started learning French this year and says that he sometimes gets the English and French words mixed up.

Pupil X

X is a grade five pupil of Greek origin attending Spanish Heritage Language class.

She was in Greek integrated Heritage Language class last year. X now keeps up her Greek by going to Greek Saturday morning class. She uses Greek with her parents but English with her brothers, sisters, cousins and friends.

X chose to go to Spanish class this year because her friends are going to Spanish class. She also likes the sound of the language. Her favorite activities in Spanish class are reading poems and singing songs. X says that the instructor and pupils make the class a delight. X feels she has made good progress in the class. She has learned the days of the week, counting, some simple conversations and a bit of reading and writing -- all within a couple of months. She is quite excited about her Spanish class and will enrol in it again next year.

At home, she neither reads Spanish nor watches Spanish television programs but gets a chance to practise the language with some Spanish speaking friends outside of class.

In addition to English, Greek and Spanish, she is also learning French. She is proud to say that she never gets the languages mixed up.

Pupil Y

Y is a grade three Italian Heritage Language pupil. She was born in Italy and has gone back to Italy for several visits. The most recent visit was last year.

She speaks Italian to her mother and grandmother but English to her father and siblings. She reads Italian books and newspapers and watches Italian television and movies. Y also writes Italian letters to friends and relatives in Italy.

Her parents want her to attend Italian class. She said she would not choose it herself. Y finds no challenge in the class and does not seem to learn anything new at her level. She learns much more Italian from her visits to Italy than from the Heritage Language class. She also says her Italian instructor screams too much in class. The activities she enjoys most in her language class are word games, gym exercises and writing.

French is another language she is learning. Of the three languages, she is most fluent in English, least fluent in French. However, she likes French the most. She has no problems keeping the languages separate.

Children in Black Cultural Classes

Pupil Z

Z is a grade five pupil in a Black Cultural class for the second year. He and his parents were born in Jamaica.

The activities Z likes best in the class are the dancing, music and acting. He likes the musical instruments they make with combs, thimbles, jars and washboards. Z also likes going to the gym to play Dodge the Ball. He says they learn about Black Cultural food. He is disappointed that some of the school trips they were promised have not materialized.

Z's parents want him in the Black Cultural class, but Z would rather be in the Concurrent class where they have art contests. Z says he has some friends in the Black Cultural class.

Z complains that the pupils in the Black Cultural class are not well behaved and that the instructor frequently sends individuals to the principal's office.

Pupil ZZ

ZZ is a grade two pupil enrolled in Black Cultural class. Her father came from Trinidad, while her mother comes from Ontario.

Her parents want her to go to Black Cultural class, but she would prefer to go to Concurrent class. This is her second year in Black Cultural class. She feels she does not learn new things from this class as she does in the regular class.

Her older sister from grade five is enrolled in the same Black Cultural class. ZZ likes being in the same class with pupils of various age groups (ranging from Kindergarten through grade six) because she gets to meet more people.

The activities she enjoys most are films, stories, colouring and special projects on famous Blacks. ZZ likes the instructor because she does not send pupils to the office for misbehaving for the first time. However, ZZ is bothered by the noise in the Black Cultural class. The instructor has to yell often to keep the noise down. ZZ also feels that the Black Cultural class has too much fun and no serious work.

Children in Concurrent Classes

Pupil AA

AA is a grade four pupil in a Concurrent class who was born in Vietnam and has just recently arrived in Canada. AA says he speaks four languages: Chinese best, Vietnamese second best, followed by French and then English. He says he does not get the languages mixed up. AA says he is picking up most of his English from his teachers and is in an ESL class. AA says he speaks Chinese to everyone in his family and does his best to communicate in English with the other pupils. Since AA's English is poor, the interview is somewhat limited and little information is gleaned about the Concurrent class except that he likes it.

Pupil BB

BB is a grade five, English-speaking pupil in a Concurrent class for the first year. For the three previous years, BB had enrolled in a Chinese language class. (Concurrent classes were not available until this year.) As a result, BB says he knows a little Chinese. However, BB says he never uses Chinese even though most of his friends at school and some of his friends around home are Chinese; all of them use English. BB is also studying French in school and feels that his abilities in Chinese and French are about the same.

In Concurrent class, they do arts, crafts, plays and music. BB says he likes the plays best. He feels somewhat dissatisfied with the music though, because he does not have his own instrument in the class.

BB's parents allowed him to enrol in Heritage Language or Concurrent class as he wished.

Pupil CC

CC is an English-speaking grade one pupil in a Concurrent class. While CC was born in Canada and her mother was born in England, CC says her grandparents are Polish and speak English.

CC's mother prefers that she be in the Concurrent class but is unhappy because the extended school day means she is no longer able to see her daughter after school, as she must leave for work at 4:15.

CC describes a number of activities that have taken place in Concurrent class, most of which she likes. She speaks most favorably of a play they did for Christmas. Other activities include games, jogging, exercising, soccer and painting murals.

Pupil DD

DD is a grade three pupil who has switched from a Hindi language class to a Concurrent class. DD persuaded his parents to let him switch because he didn't like learning Hindi and found it too hard. He says it is better to learn French, since it is easier. DD was born in Canada and speaks English to everyone in his family and all his friends. He is not sure where his parents were born but says their cultural background is Indian.

In Concurrent class, they do art, drama, exercises and make things. He likes the art best.

Pupil EE

EE is a grade four, English-speaking pupil enrolled in a Concurrent class.

In Concurrent class she says they paint, do drama and exercise. She likes the drama best. She is concerned because the painting and exercises sometimes spoil her clothes.

EE is studying French in school in a regular program.

Pupil FF

FF is a grade five pupil in a Concurrent class who was born in Chile and came to Canada in 1980. FF speaks mostly English and some Spanish with her parents but only English with her siblings and all her friends. FF wishes there were a Spanish language class in her school but says there are not enough Spanish-speaking children to begin one.

In Concurrent class, FF says they mostly do art work and puppetry. She says this arrangement is better than last year when there was no Concurrent class and five children were left behind in class with their regular teacher to do homework and such odd jobs as cleaning the blackboard brushes.

FF likes the art work better than the puppetry. She says that sometimes the kids start acting up because they think they are too smart for the class.

Pupil GG

GG is a grade three pupil in a Concurrent program. GG was born in Vietnam and came to Canada when she was two years old. She speaks mostly English and some Vietnamese with her parents and only English with her older brother. She speaks mostly English and some Vietnamese with her friends at school, all English with her friends around home and listens to only English television and radio. GG says she sometimes gets English and Vietnamese mixed up.

While GG is in a Concurrent class this year, last year she was in a Chinese language class. Her father would like her to continue in Chinese class, as he himself speaks some Chinese to her grandmother. GG did not like the Chinese class very much as she found the Chinese instructor difficult to understand. GG's parents let her make up her own mind about whether she would attend Chinese class or Concurrent class. This school has no Vietnamese class.

GG says the Concurrent program is arts and crafts where they do such things as draw pictures and make masks.

GG thinks the Heritage Language classes are good and doesn't mind that the extracurricular sports have been cancelled.

Pupil HH

HH is a grade six English-speaking pupil in a Concurrent class in a school where a large proportion of the pupils are in Chinese language classes. HH says she could enrol in a Chinese class but feels she doesn't need to learn Chinese. Her parents let her make up her own mind. HH has Chinese friends at school but communicates with them all in English. Her friends around home are English-speaking.

HH says the Concurrent class has five pupils in it. She likes it and feels she learns a lot.

They make masks and get involved with plays and music. She says it is better this year than last when there was no Concurrent program. Last year, she and a few others stayed in the regular classroom and usually used the time to finish their regular work.

HH believes the Heritage Language classes are good for the Chinese pupils.

Pupil II

II is an English-speaking pupil in a Concurrent class in a school where a large proportion of the pupils are taking Chinese language classes. II has never been in a Chinese language class and does not plan to enrol in the future. He says that English is the language mostly used in the school playground.

In Concurrent class, they learn approaches to solving problems and puzzles and how to mindstorm. II likes the class and has friends enrolled in it. He says the Concurrent class is better than last year when children not in Chinese classes would stay in the regular classroom and play games or finish their work. II feels the Concurrent program is useful to him.

Pupil JJ

JJ is a Black grade six pupil in a Concurrent class. JJ was born in Canada; his parents were born in Jamaica. JJ speaks only English and is studying French in the regular school program.

JJ's Concurrent class focuses on film making and journal writing. He likes the class, particularly what he is learning about movies.

According to JJ, there are seven pupils in the class, of different ages.

JJ's school does not have a Black Cultural class.

Pupil KK

KK is a grade three pupil in a Concurrent program. KK was born in Canada; her parents were born in Guyana. KK says she speaks English with everyone in her family and with all her friends. KK does not know what her cultural background is.

Both KK and her parents want her to take the Concurrent class rather than a language class. The Concurrent class is drama, and she likes it. They play games, do mime, sing and perform plays. She likes the games and plays best.

According to KK, there are about twenty pupils in the class -- she is not of their ages.

Pupil LL

LL is in a Concurrent class in a school where a large proportion of the pupils are in Chinese language classes. LL says she comes from a mixed cultural background of Polish, German and Indian. In this school, LL has never enrolled in a Chinese language class but has been in the Chinese school choir. She says she doesn't need to know Chinese and that English is mostly spoken in the school playground. LL's parents allow her to choose between the Concurrent and Chinese classes as she pleases.

LL likes the Concurrent program where they learn techniques of problem solving and brain storming. She says it is better than last year and that they are learning more than when they stayed in the classroom and finished their regular work.

Pupil MM

MM is a grade three Black pupil in a Concurrent class. MM was born in Canada; his parents were born in Nigeria. MM says he speaks mostly English and some of what he calls 'Nigerian' with his parents. He speaks only English with his siblings and all his friends.

MM says his parents know very little about the Concurrent class and don't know whether he should be enrolled in it. However, MM likes everything about the Concurrent art and drama class. He says they make things with bottles and patterns. He particularly likes the class when they do breakdancing and the instructor gives prizes for the best performances. There is no Black Cultural class in MM's school.

Pupil NN

NN is a grade eight pupil in a Concurrent class. NN was born in Canada; his parents were born in China. NN speaks Chinese and a little English with his parents but all English with his siblings and friends. NN has been in various types of Chinese language classes in previous years but this year has chosen the Concurrent karate class which has been offered for the first time. He likes karate class except when he gets hit. He says the Concurrent class is fun compared with the Chinese classes which he found boring and difficult.

Pupil OO

OO is a grade five pupil in a Concurrent program. She and her parents were born in Guyana. OO speaks only English and is studying French in the regular school program.

OO's parents want her in the Concurrent program which is arts and crafts. OO is not overly enthusiastic about the activities in the program. OO says they paint, make casts and dolls. She likes making the casts most. Sometimes she gets upset because she doesn't get the work finished on time.

Pupil PP

PP is a grade six pupil in a Concurrent art class. PP was born in Trinidad and came to Canada when he was four years old. He speaks English to everyone in his family and all his friends. Sometimes he tries a bit of Portuguese with Portuguese friends, and last year he enrolled in the Spanish language class for a short while. He is studying French in the regular school program.

PP likes the Concurrent program and says the arrangement is better than last year when they spent the time playing games or finishing their regular work. This year, he says, they are actually doing something. In the Concurrent class, they mainly do collages, sketches and models. He feels that a few field trips would improve the class.

According to PP, the Concurrent class has about fifteen pupils in it from grades four, five and six.

PP thinks it is good to have Heritage Language classes available for the other pupils.

Pupil QQ

QQ is a grade six pupil in a microcomputer Concurrent class. QQ was born in Canada and believes her parents were born in the United States. While her family has an Italian background, neither she nor her parents speak Italian or are interested in learning it.

QQ likes the microcomputer class where there is one computer for every pupil. She particularly likes writing stories and playing games with the machine. They also do vocabulary, spelling and typing drills on the microcomputer. QQ says she sometimes has trouble deciding what to do on the computer as the instructor doesn't always decide for them.

QQ's parents are very pleased about this Concurrent class. QQ is also looking forward to the next section of the Concurrent program which is a dance class.

Pupil RR

RR is a Chinese pupil in a Concurrent class who has previously been in Chinese language classes for five years. This year RR enrolled in the Concurrent class because he wanted to try something different and because he doesn't need or want to learn Chinese. He says he speaks English and Chinese at home but only English in the school yard with pupils from various other ethnic groups. RR says he sometimes goes to Chinese movies. RR has made up his own mind about the switch from Chinese to Concurrent class and his parents have consented. He has friends in both types of classes.

RR likes the Concurrent class where they learn how to work out problems faster; he likes it better than the Chinese class.

Pupil SS

SS is an English-speaking pupil in a Concurrent class in a school with a large number of Chinese pupils. Last year she tried the Chinese language class but gave up because it was too hard.

This year she is enjoying the Concurrent class where they learn to do group work and solve problems. She says it is different.

Pupil TT

TT is a grade six Portuguese pupil who attends a microcomputer Concurrent class.

He has been to Portuguese class for only one year, during grade 3. His parents feel that TT's Portuguese is good enough; therefore they never push him to go to Heritage Language class. They also believe that TT can learn Portuguese at home.

He is happy in the computer class and wishes he could stay in the same class all year instead of switching over to another Concurrent class after Christmas. This is his first contact with computers, and he is glad that he made the decision to enrol in this class. He enjoys playing the video games and composing music on the computers. The Story Writer, too, he says is worthwhile because it helps him with his spelling.

He has more of his friends going to Concurrent class than Portuguese class. He doubts if he will go back to Portuguese class unless the Concurrent programs are really boring.

Pupil UU

UU is a grade eight pupil in a karate Concurrent class. He is of Chinese heritage. UU speaks and understands Chinese and was in Chinese Heritage Language class the year before. However, the language class seemed more and more difficult for him, so he switched to the Concurrent program this year.

UU has lots of fun in the karate class. He feels he is quite equipped to defend himself now, in case of attack. He takes the karate class seriously and puts as much effort into it as he does his regular classes.

Although UU enjoys the Concurrent class, he would still prefer to use the time to finish his homework.

Finally, UU commented that the extended day does not seem to affect the extra-curricular activities in the school, except for last year, when the teachers withdrew their voluntary services. He does not feel more tired as a result of the extended day.

Pupil W

W is a grade six pupil in a puppetry Concurrent class. His parents came from Portugal. He went to Portuguese Heritage Language class the previous year but did not like it.

W is glad to have made the decision to switch, because he likes the Concurrent class. He enjoys making puppets and doing special projects in the class. He now has more of his friends in the Concurrent program than in the Heritage Language class.

The only complaints he has about the puppetry class are the pupils who misbehave and the high level of noise.

Pupil WW

WW is a grade five pupil in a story-telling class. She was born in Vietnam and has been in Canada for five years. Her best friends are mostly from Vietnam. They usually communicate in English. The majority of them also go to Concurrent class.

She has never been to a Vietnamese Heritage Language class because there is none offered during the regular school day in her school. She finds the Concurrent class boring, but she has no choice, except to stay.

WW's father has tried to get the school to start a Vietnamese Heritage Language class, but there are not enough pupils to form a class. Her father is concerned and upset because the children are gradually losing their Vietnamese language, especially WW's younger brother.

Pupil XX

XX is a grade six pupil of Anglo background in the Concurrent program. He went to Portuguese class for a while, but his mother feels it is time for him to have a change.

He has finished a ten-week nutrition class and is now in an arts and crafts Concurrent class. XX likes this class because art is always his favorite subject. What he enjoys most is making shadow puppets.

However, when XX compares his regular class with the Concurrent class, he finds the Concurrent class noisier and the pupils more rowdy. He also likes the regular teacher more than the Concurrent instructor because the former always brings in treats, and the latter tends not to let him speak up even though he has something important to say.

XX does not find the extended day too long, but if he had a choice, he would prefer going home earlier.

Pupil YY

YY is a grade six female pupil in the arts and crafts Concurrent class. She is of Anglo background and has never attended a Heritage Language class. During the last few years, she was left to do her homework while the other pupils attended Heritage Language classes. She definitely likes the arrangement of having a Concurrent program this year because it is more exciting and stimulating.

She just finished a ten-week block program on nutrition and is now in arts and crafts for the next ten weeks. She looks forward to her Concurrent class and does not mind staying later for it.

The Concurrent class also has pupils from grade five. She makes a lot of new friends in this class.

However, she is bothered by the noise in the Concurrent class. She complains that the pupils tend to get out of control quite often.

APPENDIX E
ONTARIO MINISTRY OF EDUCATION
MEMORANDUM 1976-77:46



Ministry
of
Education

Mowat Block, Queen's Park
Toronto, Ontario
M7A 1L2

-173-

1976-77: 46

MEMORANDUM TO: DIRECTORS OF EDUCATION
PRINCIPALS OF SCHOOLS

RE: HERITAGE LANGUAGES PROGRAM

I am pleased to inform you that, as announced in the Throne Speech of March 29, 1977, and in the Premier's speech of May 4, the Ministry of Education will implement a Heritage Languages Program to be effective as of July 1, 1977. For the purposes of this program, a heritage language is any language other than the two official languages of Canada.

An amendment will be made to Regulation 191 to allow for the provision of heritage language classes for elementary school children by all school boards.

Under this program, any group of parents will be able to approach its local school board with the request that heritage language classes for elementary school children be given under the Continuing Education Program. Such classes may be offered after school, or on non-school days, or where numbers justify an extension of the required 5-hour school day. Under this program, no student may receive more than 2½ hours instruction per week, or more than 2½ hours per day in the case of summer school classes.

To this end, the limitation on evening and summer school program enrolment, announced by memorandum on October 1, 1976, will be relaxed to accommodate heritage languages classes.

Boards wishing to set up heritage language classes must accept full responsibility for the staff, curriculum, and supervision of the classes, and subscribe to the usual conditions of evening and summer school programming. Classes may be held in a facility other than a school, provided the instructors are hired by the board and responsible to them, and provided the boards accept full responsibility for the classes, as mentioned above.


The instructors hired by the boards for these classes need not have Ontario certification but should have qualifications acceptable to the boards, the principals, and the parents' groups.

(over)

1976-77: 46

In order to avoid duplication of services, a school board may wish to enter into an agreement with another school board in respect of the provision of particular heritage language classes.

Boards operating or planning to establish heritage language classes for elementary school children, shall send to the Regional Office of the Ministry of Education by September 30, 1977, a list of their heritage language classes offered and the estimated enrolment in each class. As usual, school boards must maintain a summer school/evening class register for each class (Form ME 275 (1/76)).



R. A. L. Thomas,
Assistant Deputy Minister.

1977 06 15

APPENDIX F
INTEGRATED/EXTENDED DAY
HERITAGE AND CONCURRENT PROGRAMS
OPERATIONS MANUAL

Please Note: This Appendix contains the
full text of the operations manual.
Several pages were blank, except for a page
number, and therefore were not reproduced.

**Integrated/Extended Day
Heritage and Concurrent Programs**

OPERATIONS MANUAL

Introduction

In 1977 the Ontario Ministry of Education published Memorandum 1976-77.46 which made it possible for the Heritage Languages Program to be taught during an extension of the required instructional school day, as well as after school and on non-school days. In schools where the integrated/extended day program is offered, the Heritage classes are taught at some time during the day and the instructional day is extended by one-half hour to accommodate the program.

It is the policy of the Toronto Board of Education that:

"school principals and staffs, with the co-operation of the School Community Relations Department, if necessary, make every possible attempt to encourage the parents of their communities to enrol their children in Heritage Language classes wherever actual population warrants" (Toronto Board of Education, May 6, 1982).

TORONTO BOARD OF EDUCATION

January 17, 1985

Approved by Board, January 17, 1985.

I Designation for Consultation

The Director will consider requests for designation made by parent(s) of a school or ward trustee(s).

Such requests must be received in writing by December 1 for possible implementation in September of the following year. Requests are forwarded to the Co-ordinating Principal of Heritage Languages who refers them to the Director for consideration.

The following factors will be considered by the Director when a request has been made for an Integrated/Extended Day Heritage and Concurrent Program

- Ethno-cultural composition of the school community.
- Number of pupils from the school who are presently enrolled in the Board's Heritage Program classes.
- Number of possible integrated/extended day classes in the school.
- Any other information that will affect the implementation of this program.

Notification for Consultation

Prior to the last Board meeting in December, the Director of Education will make his decision as to which schools he will designate for consultation leading to possible implementation. He notifies the following:

- the School Superintendent,
- the Assistant Superintendents of Curriculum and Program (responsible for Heritage Languages and Concurrent Programs),
- the Co-ordinating Principal of Heritage Languages,
- the Co-ordinator of Alternative and Community Programs,
- the Co-ordinator of School Community Relations,
- Ward Trustees,
- Heritage Languages and Concurrent Programs Consultative Committee,
- the Board of Education

Upon receipt of this information, the School Superintendent will notify the School Principal who in turn will notify the school staff. The Principal will notify the parents in writing in both English and other appropriate languages (see Appendix A)

II Consultation

Purpose

The purpose of this full consultation process is to inform the staff and the parents of the following

- philosophy and pedagogy of integrated Heritage Programs including the value of language learning
- required changes in the organization of the school day
- possible difficulties, proposed solutions and implications of implementation,
- parental and staff views,
- the nature of the programs in other schools
- possible Heritage Programs and Concurrent Programs for the school

Time-Line

The consultation process will begin as early as possible in January and will be completed by the end of March each year for implementation in the following September. The School Superintendent will conduct the consultation process and ensure that it is carried out according to Board policy

Role of Participants Principal and Staff

The School Superintendent will provide an opportunity for the Principal and the school staff to be involved in a discussion of all aspects of the program such as philosophy, pedagogy and Board policy. The School Superintendent, the Assistant Superintendents of Curriculum and Program (responsible for Heritage Languages and Concurrent Programs), the Co-ordinating Principal of Heritage Languages and the Co-ordinator of Alternative and Community Programs will be involved in the consultation process as resource persons.

Community

The Principal notifies all parents by letter in Appendix A (in English and their respective languages) when the school is designated to undertake consultation for a possible Integrated/Extended Day Heritage and Concurrent Program. The community consultation process is for parents of the school and should be conducted as decided by the planning committee. It is the responsibility of all parents to make use of the consultation process to become informed about the program in order to be able to make a decision about it in their school.

Planning Committee

The School Superintendent strikes a Planning Committee to develop a community plan. The School Superintendent has the responsibility of calling the first meeting of the Planning Committee, ensuring that the minutes of all meetings are taken and that the consultation process is executed in accordance with the Committee's plan.

• Composition of the Planning Committee

The composition of the Committee will be:

- School Superintendent (chairperson),
- School Principal,
- Ward Trustees,
- One representative from the school teaching staff (if staff wishes to participate),
- School Community Relations Department Staff,
- *Appropriate Heritage Languages and Concurrent Programs Consultative Committee members,
- Chairperson(s) of the schools' Heritage Languages Liaison Committee(s),
- Chairperson of the schools' official school community organization or his or her designate,
- Where feasible up to 2 representatives of other after-school programs conducted at the school

• The following individuals will act as resource persons to the committee:

- Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum and Program (Heritage Languages, and/or Co-ordinating Principal of Heritage Languages,
- Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum and Program (Concurrent Programs) and/or Co-ordinator of Alternative and Community Programs,
- other appropriate Board Staff.

*This will include representatives of Concurrent Programs

6

IV Decision to Integrate the Program

- 1 Where more than 50% of the families who vote support the idea of integrating the program, the program is integrated. (For free-standing senior schools see Formation of Classes, section, V. 1, below)
- 2 The Area Office reports the results of the vote first to the Director (see Appendix C), who then authorizes the release of the information to the School Principal, the Assistant Superintendents of Curriculum and Program and the Ward Trustees
- 3 On the next school day, following the Director's release of the results of the voting, the Principal notifies the staff at a special meeting called for the purpose and sends out a letter to all parents, in English and other appropriate languages, notifying them as to the results of the vote
- 4 In schools where the program is to be integrated
 - On or about the 15th of May, the Principal will send out to each family a Registration Form (Appendix D), indicating the Heritage and Concurrent Programs which the school will offer and inviting parents to register their child/children in that program. The Principal will, with the assistance of the School Community Relations Department, encourage the maximum registration in the Heritage Language Program. Those parents whose first preference for a Heritage Program cannot be accommodated will have an opportunity to enrol their child/children in one of the available integrated Heritage Programs. Otherwise, the child/children will participate in a Concurrent Program
 - At the time of registration parents of new pupils in the school are informed of the program and given registration forms to complete
 - Early in June the School Principal convenes a meeting for the establishment of Liaison Committees for all integrated Heritage and Concurrent Programs. At this meeting(s) the parents will be informed of the responsibilities of a Liaison Committee and will elect their representatives. The School Superintendent will ensure that the appropriate Liaison Committee(s) are convened

5 In cases where the program is not integrated.

- The Principal will notify parents in writing in English and appropriate languages of the specific results of the vote;
- The Principal will inform parents of other times when the Heritage Program can be offered in the school;
- If a Heritage Program cannot be made available at the school, the Principal in co-operation with the Co-ordinating Principal of Heritage Languages will direct the parents to the closest program of their choice in another school

V Planning For The Integrated/Extended Day Program

1. Formation of Classes

- (i) On the basis of the Registration Form, a decision is made by the School Principal regarding the number of languages and the number of classes to be offered in both the Heritage and Concurrent Programs
- (ii) For senior schools (free-standing) - pupils (and their parents) prior to entering grades 7 and 8, will complete an option sheet for Heritage and Concurrent Programs. The integrated/extended day program will be offered in grades 7 and 8 where registration in the Heritage Program is 50% of the pupils in grades 7 and 8
(The fact that there is a required 50% registration in free standing Senior Schools will be clearly stated during the consultation process and on both the Ballot and the Registration Forms)

5

• Task of Planning Committee

- The task of the planning committee is
- to design the format of the consultation process by determining the number of meetings, the format of the meetings, agendas for meetings, resource persons for meetings.
 - to develop a written consultation plan

Role of Curriculum and Program Division Staff in the Consultation Process

The Assistant Superintendents of Curriculum and Program, the Co-ordinating Principal of Heritage Languages, the Co-ordinator of Alternative and Community Programs or their designates, and other staff as is appropriate will assist in the consultation process wherever possible

Role of School Community Relations Department in the Consultation Process

The School Superintendent and the Principal will discuss and arrange with the staff of the School Community Relations Department their involvement in the consultation process in the following ways:

- assisting in the consultation process;
- providing information to parents regarding the Heritage and Concurrent Programs;
- assisting the school Heritage and Concurrent Programs Liaison Committee(s) to participate in the planning for the programs;
- assisting the School Principal in the administration of the Ballot and Registration Forms;
- assisting the School Principal in the follow-up of the Ballot and Registration Forms with parents who do not return the form(s)

III Community Survey and Vote

- 1 Following the community information meeting(s), the Principal sends home with a pupil one ballot with a standard letter (see Appendix B) to each family in the school. The Ballot will be in English and the family's home language as is appropriate. The Ballot is to be completed and returned to the school sealed in the envelope provided by the school. In case of loss, one duplicate ballot will be provided. Each envelope will clearly identify the student, his or her grade and room number. Seven school days will be allowed for the return of the Ballots after they have been sent home
- 2 Schools will be provided with clerical assistance for this task through the Area Offices
- 3 Every effort will be made to encourage parents to return a completed ballot within the seven days. At the end of four school days, the School Community Relations Department staff will attempt to contact or arrange to have contacted by telephone the non-respondents to the Ballot and urge them to return the Ballot sealed in the envelope which has been provided. The School Community Relations Department staff will provide one other ballot when the first ballot has not been received
- 4 If in the opinion of the Area and School Superintendents the number of ballots outstanding at the end of the seven days is such as to cause concern, the matter will be discussed with the Director who may extend the time for an additional three school days while the School Community Relations staff continues to urge the parents to return the Ballot. No ballot will be opened until after the official closing date. The Area and School Superintendents are responsible for opening the Ballots, tabulating the results and reporting the results to the Director. The form for this report appears in Appendix C. This responsibility is not transferable

2. Scheduling of Classes

- (i) The instructional day is extended by one-half hour each day for all pupils in the school (except for (a) some pupils with Special Education transportation arrangements and (b) pupils in one-half day kindergartens whose day will be extended at the discretion of their parents in consultation with the Principal) in order to ensure that no pupil in the school misses any regular school subjects
- (ii) The Heritage and Concurrent Program classes are scheduled during the extended instructional day
- (iii) Only one withdrawal for Heritage and Concurrent Programs from each class in the school is to be scheduled unless otherwise approved by the Area Superintendent
- (iv) The School Principal in consultation with the School Superintendent, the Co-ordinating Principal of Heritage Languages, the Co-ordinator of Alternative and Community Programs and the Heritage and Concurrent Program Liaison Committees is responsible for the scheduling and timetabling of classes in a manner which considers the needs of the pupils and the area or citywide sharing of Heritage and Concurrent Programs instructors

3. Staffing Instructors

The staffing of the program will be done in the Spring by the School Principal in consultation with the local Heritage and Concurrent Program Liaison Committee(s) and in co-operation with the Co-ordinating Principal of Heritage Languages and Co-ordinator of Alternative Programs who will co-ordinate the staffing with other integrated/extended day programs. Instructors' rate of pay is based on the Continuing Education hourly rate paid to instructors of non-credit courses. This rate includes both vacation and statutory holiday pay.

Local School Lead-Instructors

The Principal may hire a lead-instructor for the Heritage and Concurrent Programs in each integrated/extended day school to assist him or her in such duties as purchasing of supplies, record-keeping, supervision of students, scheduling of occasional instructors and where necessary to substitute in classes for instructors in their absence. This position will be advertised. Every effort should be made to recruit people who speak the majority Heritage Language in the school and who are familiar with the local school community. Lead-instructors may be hired from 1.5 to 5 hours per day calculated on the days and times that the program is in operation. In situations where in the opinion of the Principal and the School Superintendent additional time is required, additional time may be approved by the School Superintendent.

Language Lead-Instructor

Where number of classes warrant, a language lead-instructor is hired by the Heritage Languages Department to act as a resource person for specific languages in classes across the city.

The ratio of lead-instructors to classes will vary according to the number of pupils, the number of locations, and the need for program assistance in each language. At present there are ten language lead-instructors in nine languages.

4. Program Duration

The integrated/extended day Heritage and Concurrent Programs begin in September as part of the school's regular program and end in June.

5. Program Support

The Principal will meet with Heritage and Concurrent Program instructors in order to facilitate the Program and to discuss matters such as:

- pupils' progress
- matters of concern
- integration of the Heritage and Concurrent Programs

VI Planning of Concurrent Programs

Pupils who do not participate in the Heritage Program will enrol in a Concurrent Program. The activities which are undertaken in the Concurrent Programs will be geared to the needs and interests of pupils. The options which can be offered concurrently with the Heritage Program may include enrichment programs such as:

Gross Cultural Studies, Art, Music, Dance, Drama, Storytelling and appropriate physical education activities.

Each school will select the activities which are most suited to the interests and needs of its pupils and parents. Principals will consult with parents of children in the Concurrent Program about the most appropriate options for the pupils of the school. Principals may also wish to discuss these options with School Superintendents and consultative staff.

Consideration should be given to integrating the Heritage and Concurrent Programs and to introducing into the Concurrent Program awareness of the Heritage Languages and Cultures of the local school.

The Principal, in consultation with the parents of pupils in the Concurrent Programs, will consider the options for the Concurrent Programs and will prepare a Concurrent Program plan statement. The Principal will notify parents by letter about the Concurrent Programs which pupils who are not attending the Heritage Program will receive. This notification is to take place before the Concurrent Program(s) begin.

VII Budget

Start-up Funds

A start-up supply budget of \$20.00 (twenty dollars) per pupil will be provided for new Heritage and Concurrent Program classes. These funds are provided on a one-time only basis.

Supply Budget

The annual supply budget will be based on the following formula:
Population of School - 20 students per class x \$100.00
(\$100.00 for every 20 students in the school)

Furniture and Equipment

Schools may draw on a central budget of \$5,000.00 to provide storage space (for example, cabinets and cupboards) for both the Heritage and Concurrent Programs.

VIII Program Support and Curriculum Implementation

- The Principal is responsible for the implementation of curriculum
- The Area Office provides appropriate consultative assistance for the instructors in both the Heritage and Concurrent Programs from the Area Consultants' Team
- A set of curriculum materials is provided by the Heritage Languages Department. This includes:
 - Heritage Program Policy and Procedures Manual
 - Heritage Program Core Curriculum.
 - Language Specific Curriculum or Language Specific Course Outline where available.
 - List of other language specific resource materials
- The Principal with the assistance of the School Community Relations Department will develop a local school plan to promote the Heritage Language Program. This plan may include such things as Open Houses, displays of pupils' work, cultural performances and providing information to parents about the program.

IX Program Evaluation

Program evaluation should be an ongoing process, with an official evaluation taking place in the Spring.

The School Superintendent evaluates the program in consultation with the Principal, the local Heritage Program Liaison Committee(s), the local Concurrent Program Liaison Committee, the Co-ordinating Principal of Heritage Languages, Co-ordinator of Alternative and Community Programs, the Heritage and Concurrent Program instructors and the Heritage Program lead-instructors.

X Future Consultation

These procedures are designed to implement the Integrated/Extended Day Program in our school system. Once the program has been integrated in a school it remains so unless on the basis of the review process in XI below, the Director of Education recommends to the Board that the Integrated/Extended Day Program be terminated.

XI Review Process

If the Director decides that the number of the pupils registered in the Integrated/Extended Day Heritage Programs such as to warrant a review, the Director will implement under the supervision of the School Superintendent a Review Process as follows:

1. The School Superintendent will establish and chair a Review Committee:
 - Composition of the Review Committee:
 - School Superintendent (chairperson).
 - School Principal.
 - Ward Trustees.
 - One representative from the school teaching staff (if staff wishes to participate).
 - School Community Relations Department staff.
 - Heritage Languages and Concurrent Programs Consultative Committee representative(s).
 - Chairperson(s) of the school's Heritage Languages Liaison Committee(s).
 - Chairperson of the school's official school community organization or his or her designate.
 - Chairperson or designate of the Concurrent Program Liaison Committee.
 - Where feasible up to 2 representatives of after school programs conducted at the school.
 - The following individuals will act as resource persons to the committee:
 - Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum and Program (Heritage Languages) and/or Co-ordinating Principal of Heritage Languages.
 - Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum and Program (Concurrent Programs) and/or Co-ordinator of Alternative and Community Programs.
 - Other appropriate Board staff.

• Task of Review Committee:

The task of the committee will be a two stage process.

Stage One

- The committee will consider whether the parents in the school should be consulted regarding the possible termination of the program in June of that school year.
- The School Superintendent will recommend to the Director whether the program should continue or whether the review process should begin.

Stage Two

- If the Director decides that the review process should begin, the review committee will:
 - design the format of the review process by determining the number of meetings, the format of the meetings, agendas for meetings, resource persons for meetings.
 - develop a written consultation plan.
- 2. During the Review Process every opportunity will be provided to the school community with the assistance of the Curriculum and Program Division and the School Community Relations staff, to increase the enrolment in the Heritage Languages Program.
- 3. When the review has been completed according to the plan, the School Superintendent will make a recommendation to the Director as to whether the Heritage and Concurrent Programs should continue or be withdrawn from the school at the end of the school year. The Director will make an appropriate recommendation to the Board.

Note: Notwithstanding the above, the Director may intervene in the above procedures and bring appropriate recommendations to the Board.

Appendix A

Dear Parent/Guardian

Integrated/Extended Day Heritage Program

This letter is to notify parents that _____ School will begin a full consultation process which will give parents an opportunity to consider the option of integrating the Heritage Program into an extended school day. The policy of the Toronto Board of Education ensures that the decision to integrate the program will be made by the parents of this school.

The Integrated/Extended Day Heritage and Concurrent Program provides pupils with an opportunity to study a language other than English or French or to study Black Cultural Heritage during the instructional day. While most students in Heritage Programs already speak a language in addition to English or French, the program is available to any student who would like the opportunity to study another language. For students who do not take part in the Heritage Program, a Concurrent Program which can include enrichment programs, such as language, art or cross-cultural studies, will be offered.

In order to provide for an Integrated/Extended Day Heritage and Concurrent Program, the school day would be lengthened by one-half hour for all pupils. The Heritage and Concurrent Programs can then be taught during the day.

In order that you have enough information to make a decision about this program, the School Superintendent will establish a Planning Committee that will plan parent meetings to provide you with information and answer your questions about the Integrated/Extended Day Heritage and Concurrent Program. When this consultation process is completed, parents will have an opportunity to vote on this program.

I will keep you informed as our plans for the consultation process develop. The decision that parents are asked to make is an important one and so I encourage you to participate in the consultation process.

Yours sincerely

Principal

Appendix B

School Name _____
Date _____

Dear Parent

RE: Integrated/Extended Day Heritage and Concurrent Programs

The policy of the Toronto Board of Education is to encourage the teaching of Heritage Programs (language and cultural) as part of an extended instructional school day. This is in accordance with the policy of the Ontario Ministry of Education set out in Policy Memorandum Number 7. Some of the reasons for this encouragement are:

- The learning of languages is a valuable academic activity for all pupils.
- The retention and the development of the pupil's first language has been demonstrated to help the pupil to develop skills in English and improve his or her academic achievement.
- The respect for and the learning of the pupil's first language and the study of his or her cultural heritage in school help the pupil to develop a positive self-concept.

The language classes are open to all pupils and provide opportunities for them to develop skills in a variety of languages and learn about other cultures.

If the program is integrated as part of the extended instructional school day, the following would happen:

1. The instructional day would be extended by one-half hour each day for all pupils in the school (except for (i) some pupils with Special Education transportation arrangements and (ii) pupils in one-half day kindergartens whose day will be extended at the discretion of their parents in consultation with the Principal) in order to ensure that no pupil in the school misses any regular school subjects.
2. The Heritage Program would be taught at some time during the instructional day or week.
3. Parents would decide whether or not their child or children would attend a Heritage Program.
4. Pupils not attending the Heritage Program would participate in concurrent academic programs in the school. The Concurrent Program will be determined in consultation with parents.
5. The languages offered will be based on pupil registration for the program. However, based on the number of students in our school who already speak a third language, we would expect to offer the following languages or cultural programs in an integrated/extended day program.

If you are interested in a language other than those listed, please indicate it on the Program Registration Form which will be sent out to you in May of this year. Additional languages can be offered if approximately 25 students request them.

It is important that we hear from all parents in the school. Please return the attached Ballot, in the envelope provided, by _____.

Yours sincerely,

Principal

Integrated/Extended Day Heritage Language, Black Cultural and Concurrent Programs

BALLOT

School _____

Name of Parent/Guardian _____
(please print)

Telephone Number _____

Ballot

I am in favour of the proposed Integrated/Extended Day
Heritage Language, Black Cultural and Concurrent Programs
in my school

Yes _____ No _____

Signature of Parent/Guardian

Note:

- These ballots will be opened, counted and retained in the Area Office by the Area and School Superintendents in order to safeguard confidentiality of responses. Where more than 50% of the families who vote support the idea of integrating the Heritage Program the program will be integrated
- Your signature ensures that only parents or guardians entitled to vote do so and allows the Area Office to follow up on unreturned ballots

Liaison Committees

For the purpose of developing an effective Heritage and Concurrent program at your school the Principal of the school will establish Heritage and Concurrent Program Liaison Committee(s). The Committee(s) will consist of the school Principal and Heritage and Concurrent Program parents

Integrated/Extended Day Heritage Language, Black Cultural and Concurrent Programs

BALLOT

(for free standing senior schools)

School _____

Name of Parent/Guardian _____
(please print)

Telephone Number _____

Note: The integrated/extended day program will be offered only if registration in the heritage program is 50% of the pupils in grades 7 and 8

Ballot

I am in favour of the proposed Integrated/Extended Day
Heritage Language, Black Cultural and Concurrent Programs
in my school

Yes _____ No _____

Signature of Parent/Guardian

Note:

- These ballots will be opened, counted and retained in the Area Office by the Area and School Superintendents in order to safeguard confidentiality of responses. Where more than 50% of the families who vote support the idea of integrating the Heritage Program the program will be integrated
- Your signature ensures that only parents or guardians entitled to vote do so and allows the Area Office to follow up on unreturned ballots

Liaison Committees

For the purpose of developing an effective Heritage and Concurrent program at your school the Principal of the school will establish Heritage and Concurrent Program Liaison Committee(s). The Committee(s) will consist of the school Principal and Heritage and Concurrent Program parents

Appendix C

Report to Director on Results of Community Vote
Integrated/Extended Day Heritage and
Concurrent Programs

Area _____
School _____

Number of Families in School	Number of Votes Cast	Non- Returns	Yes	No	Spotted Ballots
Percentages (based on number of returned ballots)					

Appendix D (i)

Integrated/Extended Day Heritage Language,
Black Cultural and Concurrent Programs
Registration Form

Name of School _____
Based on the number of students in our school from various linguistic or cultural backgrounds, we would expect to offer the following languages or cultural programs in an Integrated/Extended Day Program

Other _____

Please complete A or B below

A. Heritage Program

I(we) wish to register my(our) child/children in the Heritage Program as follows

Name of Child	Grade	Room	Language or Cultural Program (please specify from above list)
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____

B. *Concurrent Program

All students who do not register in a Heritage Program will be enrolled in the Concurrent Program

I(we) wish to register my(our) child/children in the Concurrent Program

Name of child	Grade	Room
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

Name of parent(s) or guardian(s) _____

(DE-JSF-07-00)

Signature(s) of parent(s) or guardian(s) _____

*For the purpose of developing an effective Concurrent Program at the school, the Principal of the school will establish a Concurrent Program Liaison Committee. This Committee will consist of the school Principal and Concurrent Program parents. The committee may make suggestions to the Principal regarding the kind of Concurrent Program offered at the school

School Superintendent

Area Superintendent

Please return to the Director of Education immediately after the count of the ballot

Appendix D (ii)

Integrated/Extended Day Heritage Language, Black Cultural and Concurrent Programs

Registration Form

(for free-standing senior schools)

Name of School _____
Based on the number of students in our school from various linguistic or cultural backgrounds, we would expect to offer the following languages or cultural programs in an Integrated/Extended Day Program.

Other _____

Please complete A or B below

A. Heritage Program

I(we) wish to register my(our) child/children in the Heritage Program as follows.

Name of Child	Grade	Room	Language or Cultural Program (please specify from above list)
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____

B. *Concurrent Program

All students who do not register in a Heritage Program will be enrolled in the Concurrent Program.

I(we) wish to register my(our) child/children in the Concurrent Program.

Name of child	Grade	Room
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

Name of parent(s) or guardian(s) _____
(please print)

Signature(s) of parent(s) or guardian(s) _____

* For the purpose of developing an effective Concurrent Program at the school, the Principal of the school will establish a Concurrent Program Liaison Committee. This Committee will consist of the school Principal and Concurrent Program parents. The committee may make suggestions to the Principal regarding the kind of Concurrent Program offered at the school.

Note: The integrated/extended day program will be offered only if registration in the Heritage Program is 50% of the pupils in grades 7 and 8.

APPENDIX G
TORONTO BOARD OF EDUCATION FACT SHEETS

Language	No. of Schools	No. of Classes	Enrollment
Albanian	1	1	36
Arabic	3	4	80
Armenian	1	14	301
Bengali	1	2	44
Cambodian	1	1	15
Cantonese	40	147	3071
Czechoslovakian	1	3	48
Dutch	1	3	60
Estonian	1	11	168
German	1	1	15
Greek	38	111	1986
Gujerati	1	2	28
Hebrew	2	6	126
Hindi	7	7	122
Hungarian	1	1	18
Italian	15	20	283
Japanese	2	14	273
Korean	3	11	200
Latvian	1	6	90
Macedonian	1	1	19
Mandarin	5	16	334
Ojibway	1	3	47
Persian	1	11	262
Polish	5	9	152
Portuguese	30	78	1288
Punjabi	6	8	145
Serbian	2	7	160
Serbo-Croatian	1	4	71
Slovenian	1	1	16
Spanish	13	19	346
Ukrainian	2	7	134
Urdu	7	7	130
Vietnamese	7	9	145

Number of languages: 33
 Number of school locations: 203
 Number of students: 10,193
 Number of classes: 545
 Integrated/extended day programs: 156
 After-school programs: 182
 Weekend programs: 207

FOR MORE INFORMATION

- Heritage Languages Department
 Telephone: (416) 591-8182
- Address
 Toronto Board of Education
 155 College Street, Room 623
 Toronto, Ontario M5T 1P6

The curriculum guideline for the program is the *Heritage Core Curriculum*. In addition to this guideline, language specific curriculum guidelines or course outlines are available for most programs. A summary of resource materials is available for all languages.

INSTRUCTORS

Instructors in the Heritage Languages Program must be acceptable to the parents, the school and the Board. Preference is given to those who hold Ontario Teaching Certification, equivalent background from another country and/or have relevant teaching experience.

HOW TO START A HERITAGE PROGRAM

The Heritage Languages Program is available free of charge to elementary school students who live in Metropolitan Toronto. To open a class, approximately 25 students are required.

Any parent, group of parents or community organization may request that a program be established. Parents interested in having a heritage language class should contact their school principal or the Heritage Languages Department, 591-8182.

CO-OPERATION BETWEEN SCHOOL AND COMMUNITY

Local Liaison Committees
 A local liaison committee consisting of parents and the school principal operates in conjunction with each Heritage Languages Program. This committee assists in staffing, scheduling of classes, curriculum and program evaluation.

Heritage Languages and Concurrent Program

This committee is composed of trustees, one elected representative from each language program, one representative from the Toronto Public School Principals' Association and four representatives for Concurrent Programs.

The function of this committee is to advise the Board of Education on matters pertaining to the program. The representatives are expected to maintain contact with the groups which they represent in order to ensure communication among parents, community members, school and administrative staff.

A membership list is available from the Heritage Languages Department, 591-8182.

AVAILABLE LITERATURE

The following materials provide more information —

- Heritage Programs* (Information for parents in 36 languages.)
- Studying Languages: A Passport to the World* (This brochure, printed in nine languages, outlines the value of studying languages.)
- Language and Cultural Enrichment Programs in Toronto Schools* (Provides information on the integrated/extended day Heritage and Concurrent Programs.)

Education Toronto — one of a series of fact sheets on the school system operated by the Toronto Board of Education

January 1986

Heritage Languages Program

Heritage Languages are defined by the Ministry of Education as Languages other than English or French.

• PURPOSE OF THE PROGRAM

It is generally recognized that all students can benefit from the opportunity to learn another language or to function more effectively in the language of their home or heritage. Both the Toronto Board of Education and the Ministry of Education believe that, in the multicultural setting of this city and province, it is particularly important that students be given opportunities to maintain and develop the ability to read, write and speak heritage languages. Such opportunities will —

- Enhance the students' concept of themselves and their heritage
- Improve communication with parents and grandparents
- Prepare students to use heritage languages in the Canadian context
- Allow students to use skills and concepts they already possess
- Provide experiences in learning that may prove a valuable basis for credit courses at the secondary school level
- Encourage students to develop new language skills that will help them to function more effectively in Canada's multicultural environment

From Ontario's *Heritage Languages Program*, Ministry of Education.

THE PROGRAM

The Toronto Board of Education is committed to the study of languages as a valuable tool that should be a part of the education of all students. The Board has offered Heritage Language Programs since they were authorized by the Ministry of

Education in 1977. At the present time the Board offers 33 languages in classes throughout the city attended by approximately 10,200 students.

The program provides an opportunity for all elementary school students to study a language other than English or French and to learn about another culture. It is an enrichment activity offered as an addition to the regular school curriculum for two and one-half hours a week. Enrollment is voluntary.

Classes may take place during the school day (in an integrated/extended school day), after school, in the evening, or on the weekend. The program can be offered in an integrated/extended school day in schools where more than 50% of the families who vote support it in a survey and where the school day is extended by one-half hour per day for all students.

In schools which offer the Heritage Program who do not participate in the Heritage Program take part in a Concurrent Program which may include enrichment activities such as language, visual arts, music, or cross-cultural studies.

Summer School Program

The Heritage Languages Program is offered in summer school and operates from various locations during the month of July and the first week in August. (See the *Summer School Directory* — available in the spring from the Continuing Education Department, 591-8238.)

CURRICULUM

The emphasis in the Heritage Languages Program is on the language in use. The four communication skills — listening, speaking, reading and writing — are studied through a variety of activities and areas including art, music, science and history. The program also introduces students to a culture of a people — to their history, literature, and their contribution to the areas of music, art, science and sports.



Education Toronto - one of a series of fact sheets on the school system operated by the Toronto Board of Education

January 1986

Black Cultural Heritage Program

The Black Cultural Heritage Program is a program in which Black elementary school students and other students interested in Black culture have an opportunity to learn about the origins, history and contributions of Black people in Canada and throughout the world. Such opportunities will -

- Encourage students to understand and appreciate their heritage
- Enhance the students' concept of themselves
- Allow students to learn about Black people and their roots
- Allow students to understand, appreciate and enjoy Black literature, including the oral tradition
- Allow students to recognize the contributions of Black people in Canada and other parts of the world
- Encourage students to understand, accept and appreciate the role of Black cultural institutions

THE PROGRAM

The Black Cultural Heritage Program has been offered by the Toronto Board of Education since 1977.

The program provides an opportunity for all elementary school students to learn about Black cultural heritage. It is an enrichment activity offered as an addition to the regular school curriculum for two and one-half hours a week during the school year. Enrollment is voluntary.

Classes may take place during the school day (in an integrated/extended school day), after school, in the evening, or on the weekend. The program can be offered in an integrated/extended school day in schools which have the Heritage Languages Program offered during the day. (For information on the Heritage Languages Program see fact sheet 44.)

Summer School Program

The Black Cultural Heritage Program is offered in summer school and operates from various locations during the month of July and the first week in August. (See the *Summer School Directory* - available in the spring from the Continuing Education Department, 591-8238.)



CURRICULUM

The curriculum introduces students to the heritage of the Black people - to their history, literature and their contribution to areas such as music, art, science and sports.

The following curriculum guidelines for the program have been developed by the Board -

- Black Cultural Heritage Program Art Units: *Literature, Music, Crafts* (primary, junior, intermediate divisions)
- Black Cultural Heritage Program History Units 1-4: *Blacks in Canada Today, Predecessors of Blacks in Canada, Africa - The Ancestral Homeland of Blacks, Current Issues in Black History*

This committee advises the Board of Education on matters pertaining to the program.

The Black Cultural Heritage Program representative is expected to maintain contact with parents which he or she represents in order to ensure communication between parents, community members, school and administrative staff.

A membership list is available from the Heritage Languages Department, 591-8182.

SCHOOLS PRESENTLY OFFERING THE BLACK CULTURAL HERITAGE PROGRAM

- Brock Public School
- Dewson Street Community School
- Earls Court Public School
- McMurrich Public School
- Queen Victoria Public School
- Ryerson Public School
- Winona Drive Public School

- 187 -

*Offered in an integrated/extended school day.



FOR MORE INFORMATION

- Heritage Languages Department
Telephone: (416) 591-8182

Address

- Toronto Board of Education
155 College Street, Room 623
Toronto, Ontario M5T 1P6



INSTRUCTORS

Instructors must be acceptable to the parents, the school and the Board. Preference is given to instructors who hold Ontario Teaching Certification, equivalent background from another country, and/or have relevant teaching experience.

HOW TO OPEN A CLASS

The Black Cultural Heritage Program is available free of charge to elementary school students who live in Metropolitan Toronto. To open a class, approximately 25 students are required.

Any parent, group of parents or community organization may request that a program be established. Parents interested in having a Black cultural heritage class should contact their school principal or the Heritage Languages Department, 591-8182.

CO-OPERATION BETWEEN SCHOOL AND COMMUNITY

Local Liaison Committees

A local liaison committee consisting of parents and the school principal operates in conjunction with each Black Cultural Heritage Program. This committee assists in staffing, scheduling of classes, curriculum and program evaluation.

Heritage Languages and Concurrent Program

Consultative Committee

An elected representative for the Black Cultural Heritage Program is a member of the committee.

APPENDIX H
COVERING LETTERS TO PARENTS
(ENGLISH AND CHINESE)



THE BOARD OF EDUCATION FOR THE CITY OF TORONTO
155 College Street, Toronto M5T 1P6, Canada, 598-4931

International Youth Year
1985



Année internationale
de la jeunesse 1985

Dear Parent/Guardian:

The Research Department of the Toronto Board of Education is studying Heritage Language, Black Cultural and Concurrent classes in the fifteen schools with an Integrated/Extended School Day. Earlier in the year, we interviewed some individual parents and various parent groups representing the different types of classes. We are now sending the enclosed questionnaire to every family.

The questionnaire elicits primarily attitudes and subjective reactions and is meant to help produce a description of the setting in terms of social, cultural, political, psychological, economic and school environmental variables.

We would greatly appreciate your attention in responding to the questionnaire which, although it is somewhat lengthy, is easy to answer.

Please note carefully how each question is to be answered and do so as honestly as possible. Your responses are anonymous.

If you have received two questionnaires, one in English and one in your heritage language, answer and return only one, in the language you prefer.

Please return the questionnaire in the stamped self-addressed envelope as soon as possible.

If you have any questions, telephone us at 598-4931 (Ext. 2005 or 2004).

Thank you.

Sincerely,

SYLVIA LARTER, Ph.D.
Research Associate

MAISY CHENG, M.A.
Research Assistant

SL:dm
Encls.



THE BOARD OF EDUCATION FOR THE CITY OF TORONTO
155 College Street, Toronto M5T 1P6, Canada, 598-4931

International Youth Year
1985



Année internationale
de la jeunesse 1985

Chinese

各位家長/監護人：

多倫多教育局的研究部門現正研究在十五間延長日間上課時間學校內設辦的正常化祖裔語言、黑人文化和同時進行課程。在年初的時候，我們曾訪問一些個別的家長及各代表不同課程的家長團體。現在我們向每一個家庭派發附上的問卷。

此問卷基本上在引出各位對此事所持的態度和主觀的反應，並以社會、文化、政治、心理、經濟和學校環境的變化程度形式幫助描繪出其背景。

我們会很感激閣下能專心回答問卷內提出的問題，雖然看來很長，但是很容易回答的。

請閣下小心處理每一條問題的答案，希望能盡量明白。閣下的回答是匿名的。

若閣下收到兩份的問卷，英文本和用閣下祖語寫的譯本，閣下只需選擇其中一份填寫交回。

請將問卷放入已貼有郵票及回郵地址的信封內，盡速寄回。

若閣下有任何問題，請電 598-4931 (內線 2005 或 2004) 與我們聯絡。

多謝各位。

Sylvia Larter
SYLVIA LARTER 博士
副研究主任

Maisy Cheng
MAISY CHENG 碩士
研究助理